THE Non-Conformists PLEA FOR PEACE IMPLEADED:

In Answer to several late Writings of Mr. BAXTER and others, pretending to shew *Reasons for the sinfulness of Conformity.*

It is the Nature of Sin, especially Pride, to be unreasonable, unpeaceable, and a troubler of the Soul, the Church, and the World. Mr. Baxters *only Way of Concord*, p. 152.

LONDON,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishop's* Head in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1680.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA

THE INTRODUCTION.

I Shall not be ſo troubleſome to my Reader, as to lead him through all that dark and dirty Labyrinth, wherein Mr. *Baxter* hath loſt himſelf; but paſs directly to that part of his Late Writings, wherein he pretends (to do what he had long threatned) to give Reaſons for the ſinfulneſs of Conformity. In the Epiſtle to the Plea, he ſays, *many Impoſitions were layd on them which they durſt not do, becauſe they fear God, and that nothing leſs than Sin ſhould hinder their Conformity*: and *p.* 135. *That they gave in Eight particulars to the Commiſſioners at the* Savoy, *which they took to be flat Sins, but had not time fully to diſcourſe one of them*, by which I gueſs, that kneeling at the *Sacrament* (for that was then diſcourſed of) was one and the chief of thoſe many hainous Sins in Conformity; what the other Seven were, I cannot find; but I believe he hath mentioned them in this Plea, though he be aſhamed to call them Reaſons, and ſays, *he will not urge the caſe, but barely mention matters of Fact, and tell us what it is they dare not do.* And if we be ſo hardy as to bear this, *we may* (when he can get leave) *have*

more, P. 119. of the Plea; *we do not here tell men, unleſs by the by, in ſtating ſome few queſtions, what it is that we account Good or Evil, much leſs do we here give the Reaſons of our Cauſe*; he dares not be ſo bold yet as to venture by it to diſpleaſe us. But this Hypocriſie is ſo thin that the weakeſt Eye may look through it; for, whereas the Right Reverend and Learned Biſhop of *Ely*, had told Mr. *Baxter* (as he confeſſeth in his Preface to the Late Book of Concord) that he would *petition Authority that they* (the Non-Conformiſts) *might be compelled to give their Reaſons*; He there ſays, *To anſwer the earneſt demand of our Reaſons, by you the Lord Biſhop of* Ely, *I have publiſhed an Hiſtorical Narrative of our Caſe and Judgment in a Book called the Non-Conformiſts Plea for Peace.* And if he may be believed, they are not only Mr. *Baxters* Reaſons, but of many others; for *p.* 3. it is ſaid, *We that publiſh this here, give an account of our own Judgment, and thoſe that we are beſt acquainted with; how far we hold it lawful or unlawful, to gather or to ſeparate from Churches, or to differ from what is eſtabliſhed by Authority.* So that plainly that Book was publiſhed to anſwer the Biſhop of *Ely*'s demand of their Reaſons for the Sinfulneſs of Conformity: But where is that allowance from Authority which he pretends to have ſo long waited for, and begged on his Knees? And where is that care not to diſpleaſe, or provoke the *Conformiſts* by ſhewing the many heinous Sins in their Conformity, when without leave of God or Man, he not only endeavours to diſpleaſe, but to ruine us? If any thing may be, this is worſe than his Hypocriſie; it is meer diſtraction and rage, when our common adverſaries

the

the Papiſts are undermining our Foundations, and there wants but a blow to throw down the whole Fabrick of the beſt of Proteſtant Churches, for any one that bears the name of Proteſtant, thus to help on their Deſign, and juſtify it too; by declaring many heinous Sins in the Conſtitution of it, and to cry, down with it, down with it, even to the ground. But (God be thanked) his Malice is as Impotent as his Words; for after Eighteen years ſwelling and labouring, *parturiunt montes*, and there appears not ſo much as a *Mouſe* to affright us: all vaniſheth like the noiſe of Armies under ground, wherewith his Predeceſſors amuſed the Nation; their long confinement hath made them ſo weak, or rather their weakneſs hath cauſed their ſo long confinement, that Mr. *Baxter* dares not call them *Reaſons*, and I hope the Nation are ſufficiently inſtructed how unreaſonable it is to be affrighted, and run into confuſion upon ſuch empty noiſes as theſe. I have here conſidered only the Arguments which concern *Miniſterial Conformity*, that of Lay-perſons being conſequent to it. And when the moſt Learned Non-conforming Miniſters, have in former and latter times yielded Conformity to our publick Ordinances themſelves, and by Example and Arguments too (for Mr. *Baxter* ſays, they wrote more againſt *Separation* than the Conformiſts themſelves) wherein Mr. *Baxter* alſo hath done his part. And when I have reaſon to think the greateſt part of the Non-Conforming Clergy are of the ſame mind; becauſe I know how great an influence they have on the Conſciences of their people, with whom they familiarly converſe, and who eſpecially adviſe them in what concerns their

common Cauſe; yet no perſon of any Note that I have heard of in all that party, who were in places of Truſt, and publick Imployment, did on the late Teſt refuſe to Communicate with the Church of *England*. And laſtly, when all our United ſtrength is too little to withſtand the attempts of our common Adverſaries: It is a wonder to me, with what Confidence, and with what Deſign (theſe circumſtances conſidered) he ſhould not only Proclaim Conformity on the Miniſters part to be impoſſible; but endeavour alſo with all his might, to withdraw the Laity from our Communion, unleſs it be to expoſe us all to Confuſion again. But I hope the Nation have been ſufficiently taught by experience, not to intruſt the Conduct of their precious Souls, as well as the Safety of their Lives, and Eſtates to ſuch Giddy and Unſtable Men. Eſpecially when they ſhall conſider on what frivolous pretences they ſtill ſeek to perpetuate the diſtractions of Church and State, and now when we are in greateſt danger, exert their utmoſt Art and Strength to divide and deſtroy us.

—— Pudet hæc opprobria vobis
Et dici potuiſſe, & non potuiſſe refelli.

The Controverſie concerning the ſinfulneſs of Conformity will be reduced to a narrow compaſs, if there be an agreement in theſe particulars. Firſt, what are the parts of the Book of *Common-Prayer*, to which we are to declare our Aſſent and Conſent. Mr. *Baxter* contends that all things named as the Contents of the Book, are parts of that Book, to the uſe whereof we declare our Aſſent, &c.

p. 159.

p. 159. of the Plea. *There is not a word in the Book that was not intended for ſome uſe; the Preface, the Calender, and Rubrick have their uſes:* And *p.* 203. *we have reaſon to doubt whether the Act for Conformity it ſelf, be not a part of the Book which we muſt Subſcribe, Aſſent and Conſent to; becauſe this Act is named among the Contents of the Book. Either* (ſaith he) *it is a part of the Contents or not. If not, we muſt not conſent to that falſhood that it is. If it is, O far be it from us that believe a God, a Judgment, a Life to come, and the ſacred Scriptures, to Aſſent and Conſent to that Act with all its penalties, ſilencing and ruining ſuch as Conform not. Anſw.* The Act for Uniformity, naming the Book of *Common-Prayer*, always names that Book as diſtinct from it ſelf, and as a thing annexed to it; and if the Parliament had injoyned the Uſe of ſome New Tranſlation of the Bible, and prefixed their Act to that Tranſlation, and required our Uſe of the ſame under penalties, our Aſſent to ſuch an Act could not ſuppoſe the Act it ſelf to be a part of the Canonical Books.

Secondly, The deſign of the Act, in theſe words, *To the intent that every perſon may certainly know the Rule to which he is to Conform in Publick Worſhip, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England, &c. *be it Enacted*, &c. Plainly ſhews what are the parts to the uſe of which we are to declare our Aſſent, which particulars are Enumerated more than once; but not a word of the Act for Uniformity, or the Act 1. *Eliz.* which in the Contents is mentioned with it, whereof Mr. *Baxter* ought to be minded; for under the Contents of the Book, the Firſt thing

mentioned is, *The Acts* (in the Plural) *for Uniformity of Common-Prayer*; whence I argue: If the Parliament intended that this laſt Act ſhould be taken as a part of the *Common-Prayer Book*, becauſe it is in the Contents; for the ſame Reaſon it may be thought they intended that other Act 1. *Eliz.* to be a part alſo, which were very unreaſonable. For then we muſt ſubſcribe our Aſſent to the uſe of Two *Common-Prayer Books*, *viz.* the Old and the New. 3. That Act of Queen *Elizabeth* explains what is meant by *Open* (or *Common*) *Prayer*. By *Open Prayer*, in and throughout this Act is meant that Prayer, which, is *for others to come unto, or hear, either in common Churches or Chappels, or Oratories, commonly called the Service of the Church*; and the intent of that Act was, that no Miniſter ſhould refuſe *to Uſe* the ſaid *Common-Prayers*, and Adminiſter the Sacraments in ſuch Order and Form as they are mentioned in the ſaid Book; or willfully or obſtinately ſtanding in the ſame, Uſe any other Rite, Ceremony, Order, Form, or manner of Celebrating the Lords Supper, *&c.* than is mentioned in the ſaid Book. This Act was Printed probably to give Light to the other, and to ſhew that the ſame thing was formerly required of Miniſters. And if the Conformiſts heretofore did not take that Act to be part of the *Common-Prayer* Book, then there is no reaſon why they ſhould take the New Act to be a part of the New Book. 4. The Book of *Common-Prayer* was compleat before the Act was made; it was firſt preſented to the King, who approving it offered it to the Parliament, who approved of it, and afterwards made their Act for Uniformity in the Uſe thereof. And whoever gathered the Contents of the Book, did no more

intend

intend to have all things named therein to be parts of the Book, than they that ſet forth the Bible with Contents to the Chapters and Pſalms, intended that we ſhould take thoſe Contents for Canonical Scripture. The Contents of *Pſ.* 149. ſays, *the Prophet exhorteth to praiſe God for that Power which he hath given to the Church over the Conſciences of Men.* But that is no part of the Text, neither the Acts, Prefaces, Rubricks, *&c.* which come not into Uſe in the Adminiſtration of Prayer, Sacraments, *&c.* any part of that Book to the Uſe whereof we give our Aſſent and Conſent. This Act doth exclude the Uſe of any other Forms (when it injoyns thoſe preſcribed in the Book for publick Worſhip) but it doth not include thoſe previous Acts, Prefaces and Inſtructions, which only tend to juſtify and inforce the Uſe of the *Common-Prayer.* But Mr. *Baxters Dilemma*, may be anſwered to the advantage of Conformity, thus; Either the Acts for Uniformity, and the Prefaces, are parts of the Book, to which our Aſſent is required, or not: if not, then our Aſſent to them is not required; if they be, then our Aſſent will be more facile upon this account. Firſt, becauſe in that Preface concerning the Service of the Church, it is thus ſaid; *for as much as nothing can be ſo plainly ſet forth, but doubts may ariſe in the Uſe and Practiſe of the ſame, to appeaſe all ſuch diverſity (if any ariſe) and for the reſolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to underſtand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book, the Parties that ſo doubt or diverſly take any thing, ſhall always reſort to the Biſhop of the Dioceſs; who by his diſcretion ſhall take order for the quieting and appeaſing of the ſame, ſo that the ſame*

order

order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book. And if the Biſhop of the Dioceſs be in doubt, then he may ſend for Reſolution thereof to the Arch-Biſhop. Here is a way opened to ſuch as think that the Acts, and Prefaces are to be Aſſented to, to clear their doubts to their ſatisfaction; the ſeveral Biſhops within their Dioceſs have a Power by Law, to explain any doubts that may ariſe concerning the Uſe and Practiſe of Uniformity, and their determinations are declared to be as Valid as the Law it ſelf: Now doubtleſs if ſober Diſſenters did conſult their Dioceſans, in ſuch Caſes as concern their Practiſe in the publick Worſhip, they might eaſily obtain ſatisfaction. Again, it is ſaid in the Preface before the Liturgy; *We are fully perſwaded in our Judgments, and we here profeſs it to the World, that the Book as it ſtood before eſtabliſhed by Law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to ſound Doctrin, or which a Godly Man may not with a good Conſcience uſe and ſubmit unto, or which is not fairly defenſible againſt any that ſhall oppoſe the ſame; if it be allowed ſuch juſt and favourable Conſtruction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all humane Writings, eſpecially ſuch as are ſet forth by authority, and even to the beſt Tranſlations of the Holy Scripture it ſelf.* If theſe Mitigations be admitted, a great many of the Objections made by Mr. *Baxter* and others would vaniſh. And if they be not admitted, Mr. *Baxter* himſelf will grant that they cannot ſafely ſubſcribe this Aſſent, and Conſent to all things contained in the Bible according to any Tranſlation. But (ſays he) *if they might but ſay, we Aſſent to all things contained, that are not by humane fra-*

ilty

ilty miſtaken, they would ſoon conform herein. See the Plea, *p.* 166. Now the Church of *England* declares here, and in the Preface to the Articles, 1564. that *they preſcribe not theſe Rules as Laws equivalent with the Word of God, and as of neceſſity to bind the Conſciences of the Subjects in the Nature of them conſidered in themſelves, but as Temporal Orders meerly Eccleſiaſtical, without any vain Superſtition, and as Rules in ſome part of Diſcipline concerning Decency, Diſtinction and Order for the time.* So that the Law leaving it to the Biſhops to remove doubts, and explain difficulties; and the Preface deſiring that things may be candidly and favorably interpreted; they are greatly to be blamed, who will take that with the Left which their Superiors offer with the Right-hand, and ſeek how to make that a Snare and a Net to intangle and ruine themſelves, which was intended only as a means to keep the Unity of the Spirit, in the Bond of Peace.

Secondly, It is granted by the *Non-Conformiſts*, That the *Common-Prayer* Book as it is now amended, and abſtracted from the Declarations and Subſcriptions required by the Act for Uniformity, is better to be Aſſented to, than as it ſtood formerly. Yet evident it is that in the days of *Edward* the 6. when it was much more liable to exceptions, there being in it Prayer for the dead, Chryſme in Baptiſme, extream Unction *&c.* (which it is ſuppoſed Mr. *Calvin* called *tolerabiles ineptias*) many Learned Men and Godly Martyrs did readily Conform to it: And in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, and King *Charles*, the Body of the Clergy (as Learned and Pious as any in the World)

to

to which the few *Non-Conformists* in each Age were no way comparable for Parts, Piety or Number, and at the beginning of the Wars, there were not in the Assembly, as Mr. *Baxter* observes, above Five or Six *Non-Conformists*. Now ever since the Confirmation of the Canons by King *James*, the 36 Canon injoyned Subscription to the 39 Articles, and the Book of *Common-Prayer*; *as containing nothing contrary to the Word of God*, (which is one of the greatest Objections now) and this the Subscriber was to do, *lubens & ex animo*, which in *English* may be rendered with unfeigned Assent and Consent, and that *he would use the same and no other*. Who can think but that *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Davenant*, *Jewel*, *Whitgift*, the two Abbots, *Usher*, *Hall*, *Prideaux*, *Brownrigg*, Doctor *Jo. Reynolds*, *Preston*, *Moreton*, *Sibs*, *Fenner*, *Whately*, and many more named by Mr. *Baxter* himself, were both Pious and Learned Men, and subscribed according to judgment and Conscience. And if the Liturgy had not been accompanied by the Acts for Subscriptions, *&c.* it is Mr. *Baxters* opinion, that multitudes would have Conformed to it (though it were an ill sign of the readiness of those Men to Conform to the whole, who when they were as Probationers on their good Behaviour, did not at His Majesties desire in his Declaration yield to the use of any part of it) so that it seems there is no such sinfulness in the Use of the Forms, *&c.* prescribed; the great quarrel is against the Parliament, for requiring such *Subscriptions as they cannot consent to, because they fear God*, p. 191. of the Plea. *It is not the sense of the Liturgie, but of*

a

a Statute of Parliament which we doubt of, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*.

3. *Non-Conformiſts* grant, that it is better to ſubmit to the practiſe of a doubtful ſmall evil, than to forbear a neceſſary and great duty: eſpecially when greater good than evil may be procured to our ſelves and others by ſuch ſubmiſſion; there is no command againſt the Croſs, Kneeling, Surplice, *&c.* nor is there any intrinſecal Turpitude in them, and therefore the practiſe of them may be ſubmitted to, rather than to break the known Commandments of God for Obedience, Peace and Charity, and to ſuffer Deprivation when they conceive there is ſo great neceſſity, and there may be ſo much benefit to the Souls of the people, as well as to the peace of the Nation, by the exerciſe of their Miniſtry.

Thirdly, let that Rule be obſerved which Mr. *Baxter* quoteth from Biſhop *Sanderſon*, *p.* 329. of the Plea: *We muſt take heed that the ſtrict Interpretation* (of words or things) *turn not into a rigid one*. Many Men by miſtake and wreſting of other Mens words, do draw Blood from that which would have naturally yielded Milk or Food; we owe Candour to all Mens Writings, eſpecially to thoſe which are ſet forth by Authority, and moſt of all to publick Laws. In that particular of Promiſſory Oaths, theſe exceptions and conditions are ever of common right to be underſtood. 1. If God Permit. 2. Saving the right of others, and as far as is Lawful. 3. Things ſtanding as they do, or in the ſame ſtate. 4. As far as I am able, *&c.* See the Plea, *p.* 329.

It is excellently ſaid by Biſhop *Sanderſon*, that

it

to which the few *Non-Conformists* in each Age were no way comparable for Parts, Piety or Number, and at the beginning of the Wars, there were not in the Assembly, as Mr. *Baxter* observes, above Five or Six *Non-Conformists*. Now ever since the Confirmation of the Canons by King *James*, the 36 Canon injoyned Subscription to the 39 Articles, and the Book of *Common-Prayer*; *as containing nothing contrary to the Word of God*, (which is one of the greatest Objections now) and this the Subscriber was to do, *lubens & ex animo*, which in *English* may be rendered with unfeigned Assent and Consent, and that *he would use the same and no other*. Who can think but that *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Davenant*, *Jewel*, *Whitgift*, the two Abbots, *Usher*, *Hall*, *Prideaux*, *Brownrigg*, Doctor *Jo. Reynolds*, *Preston*, *Moreton*, *Sibs*, *Fenner*, *Whately*, and many more named by Mr. *Baxter* himself, were both Pious and Learned Men, and subscribed according to judgment and Conscience. And if the Liturgy had not been accompanied by the Acts for Subscriptions, *&c.* it is Mr. *Baxters* opinion, that multitudes would have Conformed to it (though it were an ill sign of the readiness of those Men to Conform to the whole, who when they were as Probationers on their good Behaviour, did not at His Majesties desire in his Declaration yield to the use of any part of it) so that it seems there is no such sinfulness in the Use of the Forms, *&c.* prescribed; the great quarrel is against the Parliament, for requiring such *Subscriptions as they cannot consent to, because they fear God*, p. 191. of the Plea. *It is not the sense of the Liturgie, but of*

a

a Statute of Parliament which we doubt of, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*.

3. *Non-Conformiſts* grant, that it is better to ſubmit to the practiſe of a doubtful ſmall evil, than to forbear a neceſſary and great duty: eſpecially when greater good than evil may be procured to our ſelves and others by ſuch ſubmiſſion; there is no command againſt the Croſs, Kneeling, Surplice, *&c.* nor is there any intrinſecal Turpitude in them, and therefore the practiſe of them may be ſubmitted to, rather than to break the known Commandments of God for Obedience, Peace and Charity, and to ſuffer Deprivation when they conceive there is ſo great neceſſity, and there may be ſo much benefit to the Souls of the people, as well as to the peace of the Nation, by the exerciſe of their Miniſtry.

Thirdly, let that Rule be obſerved which Mr. *Baxter* quoteth from Biſhop *Sanderſon*, *p.* 329. of the Plea: *We muſt take heed that the ſtrict Interpretation* (of words or things) *turn not into a rigid one*. Many Men by miſtake and wreſting of other Mens words, do draw Blood from that which would have naturally yielded Milk or Food; we owe Candour to all Mens Writings, eſpecially to thoſe which are ſet forth by Authority, and moſt of all to publick Laws. In that particular of Promiſſory Oaths, theſe exceptions and conditions are ever of common right to be underſtood. 1. If God Permit. 2. Saving the right of others, and as far as is Lawful. 3. Things ſtanding as they do, or in the ſame ſtate. 4. As far as I am able, *&c.* See the Plea, *p.* 329.

It is excellently ſaid by Biſhop *Sanderſon*, that

it

if our Lawful Superiours command us any thing whereof we have juſt cauſe to doubt, we may and ought to enquire into the Lawfulneſs thereof; yet not with ſuch anxious curioſity, as if we deſired a Loop-hole whereby to evade; but with ſuch modeſt Ingenuity as may witneſs to God and the World; the unfeigned ſincerity of our deſires, both to fear God, and to honour them that are ſet over us. And if having uſed ordinary Moral diligence, *bonâ fide*, to inform our ſelves there appear nothing unlawful in it; We are then to ſubmit and obey without more ado, Biſhop *Sanderſons judgement in one view*, p. 145. But evident it is that the *Non-Conformiſts*, who ſtrain at every Gnat which they fancy to be in the commands of their Lawful Superiours, did glibly ſwallow down Camels in the impoſitions of Uſurpers; the Covenant, the Negative Oath, the Ingagement, and many other unlawful Impoſitions were generally taken without any Scruple.

A Fourth thing to be premiſed is, *That Practice is the beſt Expoſitour of the Law*: many Laws are worded ſo ſtrictly, and injoyned under ſuch rigorous penalties, as may ſerve for greater terror to evil minded Men; they do (*iniquum petere ut quod æquum eſt ferant*) command and threaten what is very ſevere, that they may obtain what is juſt and equal. And the practice of our Superiours in the caſe of Conformity ſhews; that they intended the weightier matters of the Law, Obedience, Uniformity and Decency in the publick Worſhip. If there be no contempt of Authority, no neglect of the eſtabliſhed Liturgy, by bringing in other Prayers in the room of thoſe that are preſcribed, *Lex*

non

non curat minima, neither the Law of God or Man is ſollicitous about circumſtances and the leſſer punctilioes. There are in moſt Laws, ſome doubtful words and expreſſions which the practiſe of Law, and the Judges do interpret; ſome *Caſus omiſſi*, which the practice doth admit, as in the preſent Law: it admits the Forms of Prayer and Praiſe on extraordinary occaſions for Faſting and Thankſgiving. It admits of Singing the Pſalms, as tranſlated in Metre, and of other Forms of Prayers before and after Sermons. If the Law ſhould be ſtrictly executed according to the rigour of it, there are but few Men would go unpuniſhed; God himſelf doth diſpenſe with many things expreſly enjoyned for the performance of ſome more neceſſary duties: I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice; and St. *Paul* did Circumciſe *Timothy* to avoid greater inconveniencies, when doubtleſs he had rather not have done it. And as we may do ſome things, ſo we may omit ſome other which are injoyned by Law, according to the exigency of circumſtances; ſo it be done without bewraying contempt of Authority, or giving juſt occaſion of ſcandal to others, Biſhop *Sanderſon p.* 19. of Submiſſion to Superiours.

The laſt thing that I ſhall premiſe is, that the *Non-Conformiſts* are not yet agreed, what that is in our Conformity which they think to be ſinful: For what ſome think *unlawful*, others condemn only as inconvenient. One ſticks at the Sign of the Croſs, another at Kneeling at the Sacrament, a third at the Surplice, a fourth can ſubmit to all theſe, but ſticks at Re ordination, which different judgment of diſſenters gives juſt cauſe to believe

that

that there is no real ſinfulneſs in either; becauſe what ſome think to be ſinful, others grant to be lawful: Theſe things being premiſed, I come to the buſineſs of Miniſterial Conformity.

" Mr. *Baxter* tells us, §. 7. that the root of the " difference is this. That the *Non-Conformiſts* " thought that they ſhould ſtick to the meer Scri- " pture rules and ſimplicity, and go far from all " additions which were found invented or abuſed " by the Papiſts, in Doctrine, Worſhip and Go- " vernment, (againſt which Opinion Mr. *Baxter* " diſputes *part.* 3. *ch.* 2. of his *Directory.*) And the " *Conformiſts* thought that they ſhould ſhew more re- " verence to the Cuſtomes of the Antient Church, " and retain that which was not forbidden in " Scripture, which was introduced before the ripe- " neſs of the Papacy, or before the year 660. and " common to them with the Greek; which doubt- " leſs was the ſounder Opinion. So that the Foun- dation of *Non-conformity* was lay'd on a falſe prin- ciple; and they that built thereon, frequently raiſed Sedition, and would have as certainly deſtroyed the Nation as they did one another, had they not been prevented. For Mr. *Baxter* obſerves, that ſome of them were ſo hot at home, that they were put to death (not for their Non-conformity, but for Murder, Treaſon or Blaſphemy, as the Hi- ſtories of thoſe times ſhew) Others as *Ainſworth*, *Robinſon*, *Johnſon*, *&c.* fled beyond Sea, and there gathered Churches, and broke by Diviſion among themſelves. And whereas Mr. *Baxter* ſays, that the difference among the Exiles at *Frankford*, was, that Dr. *Cox*, and Mr. *Horne*, and their party ſtrove for the *Engliſh* Liturgy, and the other party for

the

the freer way of praying from the preſent ſenſe and habit of the ſpeaker: It will appear to him that reads the *Troubles of Frankford*, that the Queſtion was not between the *Engliſh* Liturgy, and ſuch free Prayers which were not then publickly uſed: For *Calvin* himſelf uſed a Liturgy at *Geneva*, and a ſhort Form before his Sermons, and ſometimes that which we call Bidding of Prayers, as may be ſeen after his Sermons on *Job*, Printed in *Engliſh*. And Mr. *Calvin* thus relates the matter, *p.* 33. of his *Opuſcula*. When the Exiles could not agree about the *Engliſh* Liturgy, they did by my Advice and Approbation, draw up another, Printed in the *Engliſh* Tongue 1556. wherein was a Confeſſion taken out of *Daniel* the *9th.* a Prayer for the whole Church, the Lords Prayer, the Creed, *&c.* the reſt of this Section carrieth its Confutation with it. The 8. §. concerns the conformity of Lay-men, which falls under that of Miniſterial Conformity, §. 9.

Where firſt of Aſſent, Conſent and Subſcription, nothing is contrary to Gods word, *&c.* This as Mr. *Baxter* obſerves is required by the 36. Canon, not by the Act or the Book it ſelf. Now if we conſider by what Men this hath been ſubſcribed to ever ſince thoſe Canons were Confirmed, and what Latitude the Church ſeems to allow us in making this Subſcription, *viz.* If we ſhall allow it ſuch juſt and favourable conſtruction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all humane Writings; eſpecially ſuch as are ſet forth by authority, and even to the beſt Tranſlation of the Holy Scripture it ſelf (which as you have ſeen Mr. *Baxter* himſelf doth grant) they that Scruple

at this, may alſo refuſe to ſubſcribe any Articles, Confeſſion of Faith, yea even the Apoſtles Creed. This therefore is already anſwered; and ſo is the next Objection, that the Subſcriber will uſe *that Form in publick Prayer*, &c. *and none other*: For other occaſional Forms for Prayer and Thankſgiving commended to us by authority, may be uſed without violating this Subſcription, it being *Caſus omiſſus*, the conſtant practice of the Church ſhewing that this exception was intended though not expreſſed, and that conceived Prayers before Sermons are not hereby forbidden, the general practice doth evince.

All Law-givers do leave to the Judges and Magiſtrates, a Power to interpret the doubtful Letter of the Law, and to mitigate the rigour of its Execution, in order to the publick good, and diſpenſeth with the Subjects (ſo be it they obſerve the chief end of the Law) in the omiſſion of ſome circumſtances on reaſonable occaſions, and unavoidable accidents, without which Juſtice would be turned into Wormwood. He therefore that preſumeth of the Magiſtrates conſent to diſpenſe with the Obſervation of the leſſer parts of the Law, on juſt occaſions, and in needful caſes, preſumeth no more than he hath reaſon to do: And this Biſhop *Sanderſon* groundeth on that Maxim, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex*: All that is required by the Act, is unfeignedly to Aſſent and Conſent, that there is ſuch a meaſure of Truth and Goodneſs in the Book of Common-Prayer, as qualifies it for the publick Worſhip of God; which even they that pretend diſorders and defects in it may do, in Obedience to Authority for the ſake of Peace,

Peace, Order and Charity, as well as for the continuing of themſelves in the Miniſtry. And doubtleſs they may approve of the preſent Liturgy with all its defects, (which was compiled by the Holy and Learned Martyrs, and hath been reviewed and approved by many ſtout Confeſſors, as well as of their (ſo he calls his new Liturgy) *more correct Nepenthes*, which being done in haſte, hath many Imperfections, or the Directory that had, nor Creed, nor Decalogue (both which leave Men to their own extemporary Conceptions:) And in a ſhort time juſtled out the Lords Prayer too.

The title of the Act, which is the Key that opens the ſenſe and intention of the Law-givers, is *an Act for Uniformity of publick Prayers, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies*; ſo that if Uniformity be unfeignedly obſerved, the Act is ſatisfied, though the Conformiſt may wiſh that ſome things in the ſaid Book had been amended. But ſome Men are ſo unhappy as to contrive Nets and Snares to involve themſelves and others, and raiſe nice diſtinctions where the Law diſtinguiſheth not. As do they, who ſay *Aſſent* implies the *Truth*, and *Conſent* the *goodneſs* of the things; 2. And whereas the Act ſays to *all things*, they ſay it means *all words* and *expreſſions*. 3. Whereas it ſays to *the Uſe* of all things, they pretend it to be meant of thoſe things that come not into Uſe; and 4. whereas it ſays, *in ſenſu compoſito*, all things *contained and preſcribed in, and by the Book, &c.* they ſay it is extended to all things that are contained, as well as preſcribed. Now to the Firſt, the Phraſe of *Aſſent* and *Conſent*, being uſed by our Legiſlators, we muſt ſatisfie

our ſelves of the meaning of it, in the uſe of our Laws, where it ſignifies no more than an agreement between parties in grants and contracts, and is uſed where the parties agreeing, in ſome caſes might wiſh that it had been otherwiſe; yet upon conſiderations may unfeignedly Aſſent and Conſent to them, as is ſhewed at large by Mr. *Faukner*, p. 91. *&c.* 2ly. Whereas they extend it to every Phraſe and Expreſſion; the Act mentions only the things which it particularly enumerates, *viz.* all the *Prayers*, *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, *Forms and Orders*.

3. Whereas it ſays, to the *Uſe* of all things, they pretend it requires our Aſſent and Conſent to ſuch things as come not into Uſe, but are only occaſionally mentioned; as when it is ſaid in the Preface, "That this Book as it ſtood be-"fore eſtabliſhed by Law, did not contain in it "any thing which a godly man may not with a "good Conſcience uſe and ſubmit to; which clauſe cannot be included in the Declaration, for then the things which were thought fit to be altered, muſt be ſtill in ſome ſort Aſſented to.

4. The Act mentioneth the things, to the Uſe whereof we are to Aſſent and Conſent (*viz.*) *the things contained and preſcribed, in and by the Book*, &c. It is not ſaid contained in, or preſcribed by; but three ſeveral times it is carefully expreſſed, as well before and after, as in the Declaration; ſo that it ſeems to require no more than is expreſſed in the ſecond Declaration; *I will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of* England, *as it is now by Law eſtabliſhed.* Nor can it be reaſonably thought, that our Law-makers require more in

our

our Conformity to the preſent Liturgy, than they themſelves declared concerning the Old; in theſe words, *We are perſwaded in our judgments, and we profeſs it to the World, that the Book as it ſtood before eſtabliſhed by Law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to ſound Doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a good Conſcience uſe and ſubmit unto, or which is not fairly defenſible againſt any that ſhall oppoſe the ſame, if it ſhall be allowed ſuch juſt and favourable Conſtruction, as in common equity ought to be allowed to all humane Writings; eſpecially ſuch as are ſet forth by authority, and even to the very beſt Tranſlations of the Holy Scripture it ſelf.* Now if Diſſenters would uſe this Candor, in judging of thoſe things preſcribed to be uſed for Uniformity ſake, they might no doubt declare their unfeigned Aſſent and Conſent unto them. But Mr. *Baxter* puts all out of doubt, that the Act requires more than a bare Aſſent to the Uſe of the Common-Prayers, *&c.* "Becauſe the "Houſe of Lords added to another Bill, which "was brought into their Houſe, a *Proviſo*, that "the Declaration ſhould be underſtood but as ob-"liging men to the uſe of it; and the Houſe of "Commons refuſing at a conference about it, they "gave in ſuch reaſons againſt that Senſe and Pro-"viſo to the Lords, upon which they did ac-"quieſce and caſt it out. If ſo, the Biſhops in the Houſe of Lords were more your friends than the Commons. 2. It is fit we ſhould unfeignedly approve of thoſe Services which we offer to Almighty God, and not barely ſubmit to them as to burdens. 3. Much leſs, if our judgments tell us they are ſinful; or, 4. To uſe them as the *Phariſees*

riſes did their Prayers for miſchievous deſigns, §. The Papiſts are not the only men that have their Emiſſaries, who ſerve themſelves into ſuch Aſſemblies as they approve not of; that they may have better opportunities to prepare the Minds of men for, and to ſerve the occaſions of doing miſchief.

Apol. againſt *Burton.*

Theſe, and ſome other ſuch might be the weighty Conſiderations which Mr. *Calamy* ſaid, prevailed with him and many of his Brethren, for their ſo late laying down the Common-Prayer; and for theſe reaſons, many would ſtill yield a feigned and partial ſubmiſſion to the uſe of ſome parts of it, that they might have advantages to deſtroy the whole: And certain it is, that ſuch Conformiſts draw more prejudices on the Church, than the Non-Conformiſts can do. There was therefore great reaſon for all this Caution, that men might not mock God, nor delude their Superiours in things that concerned his publick Worſhip, and his Churches peace. And I fear that they who cannot ſerve God unfeignedly in the Communion of our Church, will do it but hypocritically any where elſe.

And laſtly, I have heard concerning the pretended *Proviſo* that the Commons anſwered, that they had expreſſed the Obligation, to be only to the uſe of things preſcribed ſo plainly, that it needed no further explanation, with which the Lords were ſatisfied.

I conclude this with a Direction of Mr. *Baxter*, §. 27. of his Directory. *If any impoſe an ambiguous Oath, and refuſe to explain it, and require you only to take*

take it in thoſe words, and leave you to your own ſenſe. If a lawful Magiſtrate command it, or the intereſt of the Church or State require it; I ſee not but he may take it on Condition, that in the plain and proper ſenſe of the words, the Oath be lawful, and that he openly profeſs to take it in that ſenſe. And Q. 152. he determines, that *it is lawful to profeſs or ſubſcribe our Aſſent and Conſent to humane Writings, which we judge to be true and good, according to its meaſure of Truth and Goodneſs; as if Church-confeſſions that are ſound, be offered for our conſent; we may ſay or ſubſcribe, I hold all the Doctrine in this Book to be true and good.* And this he cannot deny of the things preſcribed to be uſed by the Liturgy. And if as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, the preſence of Godfathers, who hear the Charge concerning the Education of Children, implyes their conſent: So doth the preſence of ſuch as come to our Congregations to Worſhip God according to the Liturgy, imply their Aſſent and Conſent to the ſame. This is a *real*, and that which is required, is but a *verbal* Declaration of our Aſſent; So much of Aſſent, *&c.* in general.

P. 160. Mr. *Baxter* inſiſts upon ſome particulars, unto which the Non-Conformiſts cannot give their Aſſent: The firſt is, the Rules given (in the *Rubrick*) to know when the moveable Feaſts, and Holy-days begin. Where it is ſaid, that *Eaſter-day* on which the reſt depend, is always the firſt *Sunday* after the firſt Full Moon, which happens next after the 21. of *March*. To which I anſwer, that this being a general Rule, it may be allowed to have ſome exception. 2. The *Rubrick* doth not ſay, *a Rule*, but *Rules*, in the Plural. Now,

though this Rule be defective, yet Mr. *Baxter* grants there is another ſubjoyned, which is more perfect, and the practice of the Church guides us in following that Rule which is perfect. So that where the firſt Rule fails, the defect is to be ſupplyed by the ſecond: And then the defect never coming into practice, our Aſſent to it is not required, being limited to the Uſe of things only. And Mr. *Baxter* might have as well objected againſt the Almanack, which ſays, *February hath* 28. *days*, when as it is afterward intimated, it hath *ſometimes* 29. *days*. So that this Objection is frivolous, and ſerves only to ſhew that the Non-Conformiſts find great want of more ſubſtantial reaſons againſt Conformity, while they catch at ſuch Shadows as this.

P. 162. *We Aſſent to approve of, and Conſent to theſe words in the Preface; We are fully perſwaded in our Judgments, and we here profeſs it to the World, that the Book as it ſtood before eſtabliſhed by Law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God*, &c. Where Mr *Baxter* omits thoſe Proviſo's, which in his own Judgment (as hath been ſhewed) would make ſuch a Profeſſion lawful, *viz. If it be allowed ſuch juſt and favourable Conſtruction, as in common equity ought to be allowed to all humane Writings; eſpecially ſuch as are ſet forth by authority, and even to the very beſt Tranſlation of the Holy Scripture it ſelf.* This is not candidly done.

But Mr. *Baxter* is guilty of another wilful miſtake in this particular, greater than the former, when he ſays, we Aſſent and Conſent, and approve of theſe words in the Preface; whereas he well

well knows our Aſſent to the words there mentioned is not required nor could be intended; for it is only a profeſſion of our Superiours that were then in Being, what their Judgment and Belief was concerning the Old Common-Prayer Book, and if we think charitably of them as we ought to do, (that they meant as they ſpake) this is all that is required of the Subſcribers to Aſſent unto, if the Preface come under the Act for Conformity. And therefore to ſay no worſe, Mr. *Baxter* very inconſiderately ſays, *p.* 164. *Theſe things we muſt approve in the foreſaid approbation of all things in the Old Common-Prayer Book.*

3. Mr. *Baxter* doth very ill to recount thoſe miſtranſlations in the Old Book, which are amended in the New Book of Common-Prayer whereby our Aſſent to it is much more facile, though (under the Proviſo's before mentioned) as our Superiours thought them defenſible. So many pious men (in the account of all the Non-Conformiſts) did ſubſcribe unto the Old Book, as containing nothing contrary to the word of God. And when our *Aſſent, &c.* is required only to the New Book; as it ſtands amended, there is no fear of our being required to Aſſent to the Old Book and its Imperfections; which yet Mr. *Baxter* inſinuates as if it were included under this Declaration in the Preface, and did concern the preſent Conformiſts, which Mr. *Baxter* knows to be falſe, and contrary to the end of ſuch alterations, as well as to the meaning of that profeſſion in the Preface. As to that Tranſlation of *Pſ.* 105. 28. which in our preſent Liturgy is, *They were not obedient to his Word*; and in the New

Tranſla-

Tranſlation, *They rebelled not againſt his Word*; which Mr. *Baxter* ſays are clear contrary: It will not appear to be ſo, if it be conſidered that in the Tranſlation uſed in the Liturgy, which is according to the *Septuagint*, the *Arabick*, *Syriack*, *Ethiopick*, and many *Latine* Copies; the *Pſalmiſt* is underſtood to ſpeak of the *Egyptians*, who, notwithſtanding the wonders done upon them, *were not obedient to the Word of God*, whereas others underſtanding the Verb to refer to *Moſes* and *Aaron*, or as *Junius* and *Tremelius* underſtand it, to the *Signs* and *Wonders* which God commanded againſt the *Egyptians*, Tranſlate it, *they rebelled not againſt his Word*; both which Interpretations are true and agreeable to the Hiſtory, and therefore (if Mr. *Baxter* could have given them a favourable conſtruction, as was deſired by his Superiours) he would not have ſaid they were clearly contrary. The ſame anſwers may ſerve to the exception againſt the Collects of the Old Book, which for ſeveral days together uſed the words *this day*, which is now altered in the New Book into *this time*, which is the ſame with *day* in a large ſenſe. But little reaſon have they to object againſt any Words or Phraſes uſed in our Liturgy; who are ſtill fond of Singing Pſalms according to the Tranſlation of *Sternhold* and *Hopkins*, far more defective than any in the Liturgy.

The next Objection is concerning the reading of ſome part of the *Apocrypha*, concerning which, I anſwer in general; that the Church hath ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed in her Articles and Homilies, as well as in the Liturgy it ſelf, between the *Canonical* and *Apocryphal* Books. 2. The times when the

the *Apocrypha* Leſſons are to be read, are known by the *Calender* to be between *Sept.* 28. to *Novemb.* 24. 3. This is to be read only on the *Week days*, not on *Sundays*. 4. It is granted by Mr. *Baxter* that the ſounder Books may be read. 5. The 5 *Chap.* of *Tobit*, and that part of the 46 *Chap.* of *Eccleſ.* which ſpeaks of *Samuels* Prophecying after his death are omitted. 6. The Non-Conformiſts think there is Liberty granted in the Preface, to the Second Book of Homilies to change ſome Leſſons. But it is ſtill Objected, that by reading of theſe, the Scripture is for that time excluded. *Anſw.* This is ill urged by thoſe Non-Conformiſts, who for many years together, omitted the Reading either of Pſalms or other Scriptures in their publick, as well as private meetings, contenting themſelves with a Singing Pſalm, and an Harangue of Extemporary Prayer and Preaching. 2. Many ancient Fathers have taken pains to Tranſlate and Expound them, and commend them as containing many uſeful Moral Inſtructions. *Irineus*, *Tertullian* and others cite *Bel* and the *Dragon* as an Example for Martyrdom. *Origen* defended the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*. So did St. *Herom*, who alſo propounded the Hiſtory of *Judith*, as an inſtance of Love and Courage on behalf of our Country, which may ſerve as an Anſwer to that other Objection, that many of our Divines account them fabulous, and to contain many untruths. And ſo we ſay ſtill, if we take in all the *Apocrypha* Writings, but deny it of thoſe that are retained by our Church; againſt which Mr. *Baxter* excepts. 1. That the intrails of a Fiſh are ſaid to drive away Devils, and keep

keep them from returning, whereas Chriſt ſaith, this kind goeth not out but by Faſting and Prayer. *Anſw.* This ſaying of our Saviour concerning one kind, doth not exclude the uſe of other means joyned with Prayer and Faſting, as for ought we know was here done; for the ejecting of ſuch evil Spirits, as affected the parties poſſeſſed with Bodily Diſeaſes and Infirmities, of which many inſtances may be given.

And why ſhould we ſo limit the goodneſs and Power of God, as to think that if he ſent an Holy Angel for the Preſervation of a good Man, (which he often did before the coming of Chriſt) he could not bleſs any *means* for the effecting of a good end. The next paſſage excepted againſt by Mr. *Baxter*, is that, where the Angel ſays, that he was the Son of *Ananias* of the Tribe of *Nephthali:* Whereas the Scripture frequently calls Angels by the name of ſuch *Men* as they repreſent, *Gen.* 19.12. The Angels ſent down to *Sodom* are called *Men*; the Angels that appeared at the Aſcenſion are called *Men* in white Apparel; beſides, theſe names were aſſumed as ſignificative of the end wherefore the Angel was ſent: *Azarias* ſignifying the help of God, and *Ananias* the Grace and Favour of God. But it is farther Objected, that it is not appointed that the Prieſt ſhall tell the People that thoſe Leſſons are Apocryphal, or what that word ſignifyeth. *Anſw.* Neither is it denyed them to inform the People, as oft as ſuch Leſſons are to be read. And laſtly, Mr. *Baxter* thinks that the chief doubt is, whether the Calender appointing thoſe Leſſons may be conſented to; which upon ſuppoſition that thoſe Leſſons

contain

contain nothing contrary to Gods Word or ſound Doctrine, may undoubtedly be done, eſpecially in caſe of Deprivation. Mr. *Baxter* reſolves the caſe thus: *p.* 191. "That the Apocrypha is no part "of the Book to which we muſt Profeſs, Aſſent, "Approbation and Conſent, nor to which by "the Canon we muſt, *ex animo* ſubſcribe, that "there is nothing in it contrary to the Word of "God.

P. 167. Mr. *Baxter* reſumes the buſineſs of Godfathers againſt which he multiplyeth words rather than objections; as 1. That no Parent is permitted to be Godfather to his own Child, or to ſpeak at his Baptiſm, or Dedicate him, or promiſe in his name, or to undertake any part of his Education. All which is frivolous, for the Godfathers are to be Sureties, for the credibility of the Parent as well as for the Child, and ſo the word Surety implyes that the Parent is the principal; and who ever thought the Church intended to *exclude* the Parents Duty, to which the Law of God and Nature bind him, and from which nothing but death can excuſe him? Nor did ever any good Man think that his procuring of Godfathers, did ſuperſede his duty towards his Child, but that it was his duty more eſpecially to do what they promiſed in behalf of the Parents. And though it be not expreſſed, that the Godfather is the Parents Repreſentative; yet the contrary is not implyed, as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, becauſe (as he there ſays) the Parents are to procure the Godfathers, and how can Mr. *Baxter* tell whether he beſpeaks him to be his Repreſentative or not? *Calvin* adviſed the Parent to bring his Sureties

with

with him, *Epiſt.* 302. And that they ſhould anſwer to the Interrogatories which was the practice at *Geneva*, and by *Beza* approved in the Church of *England*, *Quis damnare auſit? Epiſt.* the 8. to *Grindal.*

As to his demand, whether it be not enough that the Baptized Infant be the Child of a Believing Parent? I anſwer, the Church thinks it ſufficient in the caſe of private Baptiſm, where no more is required; yet the Church may require witneſſes, that the Parent is ſuch a one, under which notion they do repreſent him; and for the better Aſſurance, the Church requires that the Godfathers themſelves be ſuch as have received the Holy Communion, *i.e.* in the Language of the Primitive Church, that they be *fideles.*

But he makes another Query, whether the Godfathers Act be truly the Childs in Gods account? *Anſw.* That Infants may be ingaged in a Covenant with God, cannot be denyed. They were entred into a Covenant by Circumciſion, under the Law, *Deut.* 29. 11. 12. And for this reaſon, our Children may be called *Holy*, as entred to a Covenant with God, and receiving the Priviledges of Baptiſm, and fit it is they ſhould be early obliged to the Duties of the Covenant. And being not capable to do this of themſelves, it is requiſite that ſome others ſhould do it on their behalf, with that ſolemnity which becomes ſo great an Ordinance. *Buxtorf.* mentions a *Suſceptor* at the Circumciſion of Infants under the Law. And many Divines think that Cuſtom was practiſed from, *Iſa.* 8. 2. 3. of which ſee the Notes of *Junius* and *Tremelius*, *in Locum.*

Mr. *Calvin*

Mr. *Calvin* to *Knox*, *Epiſt.* 285. I confeſs that Stipulation is neceſſary, for nothing is more prepoſterous than that thoſe ſhould be ingrafted into Chriſts Body, whom we may not hope to be his Diſciples; wherefore if none of the Kindred appear, that may give his Faith to the Church, and take charge of Teaching the Child; it is but a Luſorious Action, and the Baptiſm is defiled.

Tertullian among the Ancients, ſpeaks of Sureties for Children at Baptiſm, and of the Three Interrogatories concerning their Belief of the Creed, Renouncing the Devil, and the Chriſtian-Warfare, and ſome think there is an Intimation of the ſame, in the 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. St. *Cyprian*, St. *Auguſt.* and many *others* mention the ſame. The Reformed Churches have owned this Practiſe: The *Bohemian*, *Geneva*, *Dutch*, *French*, and many able Divines have defended it. And it is reſolved by them that the words, *I Believe*, *I Renounce*, *&c.* being a Form of words to expreſs the contract, do oblige the Infant, which was anciently done, *alio proteſtante*, and therefore the queſtion being asked of the Godfather in the Childs behalf; *doſt thou Believe and Renounce, and wilt thou be Baptized?* It is plain that the anſwer alſo is in the Childs name, and the Catechiſm ſays, Infants are Baptized, becauſe they *Promiſe Faith and Repentance by their Sureties.* Now if Children may be ingaged, and there be no way of doing it, but by ſome others on their behalf, ſeeing this way of Godfathers hath been uſed by the Churches of God; who can doubt but that their Act may truly be accepted of God as the Act of the Child,

Child? and when we grant that the Parent joyns in the ſame Act with the Godfathers, whom he procures, and may bring with him and ſignify his Conſent, and receive the Charge, which though it bind the Godfathers to do their honeſt endeavour, yet it is more eſpecially incumbent on the Parent; I ſee no reaſon but we may Aſſent to this.

And thus, the 9. Object. that Miniſters muſt Aſſent to all this Excluſion of the Parents, and Preſentation, Profeſſion, Promiſe, and undertaking of the Godfathers is anſwered. All this Excluſion is none at all, the Liturgy ſays nothing of it; the Canon ſays only he ſhall not be urged to be preſent, and the Reaſon is ſuppoſed; becauſe in time the ancient Uſe of Godfathers would be laid aſide, which all Proteſtant Churches have carefully continued.

P. 169. Mr. *Baxter* excepts againſt the *Rubrick* which ſays, *It is certain by Gods Word, that Children which are Baptized, dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved. Anſw.* 1. This being a *Rubrick*, and never coming to Uſe in the publick Worſhip; it cannot reaſonably be thought to be impoſed as an Article of Faith on others; but only as the Judgment of our Superiours, with whom, for ought I perceive, Mr. *Baxter* is more offended than with that Doctrine: For *p.* 172. *N.* 12. When young unſtudied Men (as he calls thoſe of the Convocation, who declare this Opinion, *p.* 172. *N.* 12.) "have in this "point attained to an undoubted certainty, which "their wiſer Seniors cannot attain, it behoveth "them to convince us of the Truth of their In-

ſpiration

"ſpiration or ſpecial Indowments, either by a pro-
"portionable excellency above us in other things;
"or by ſome Miracles or Teſtimonies from Heaven.
Thus did ſuch wiſer Seniors in our Saviours time require a Sign from Heaven, for Confirmation of his Doctrin, though he taught nothing but what was Conſonant to the Law and the Prophets. He is angry with them for not Citing one word of God in the *Rubrick* to ſhew this certainty: Whereas had Mr. *Baxter* been imployed in ſuch a work, he could have quoted an Hundred at leaſt, *viz.* all thoſe places which ſpeak of Baptiſme for remiſſion of Sins, of Ingrafting and Burying with Chriſt, of being Baptized into one Body, by one Spirit and the like, *Acts* 2. 37. *Acts* 22. 16. *Rom.* 4. 11. 1 *Cor.* 1. 15. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Eph.* 5. 26. *Col.* 2. 12. *Titus* 3. 5. *Rom.* 6. 3. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. All and each of which are as plain Scripture-Proofs of the Salvation of Baptized Infants, as any that he produceth for their Baptiſme; yet he calls it clear Scripture Proof.

Mr. Baxter is the firſt that hath accuſed the Church of *England* of Inſtituting a ſecond Covenant of Grace. But, how impertinently, will appear from the diſtinction (which he mentioneth) of a Sacrament out of the Church Catechiſme, viz. *An outward and viſible Sign, of an inward and Spiritual Grace, given to us, Ordained by Chriſt himſelf, as a means whereby we receive the ſame, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof.* But Firſt, here is no intimation of any *inward or Spiritual Grace*, given to us by this outward Sign. Nor Secondly, is it pretended that the Croſs is *Ordained by Chriſt himſelf*; much leſs that it is *a means whereby we re-*

ceive that Grace. Or, 4. *A Pledge to Aſſure us thereof.* And therefore Mr. *Baxter* doth not well to queſtion, whether the Croſs be not made a Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace, or ſo very near it as to have the greateſt part of that Sacramental Nature, when no one part of the definition agreeth with it. And it is confeſſed by Mr. *Baxter*, that the Liturgy uſeth not the Croſs as a *part* of *Baptiſme*, but as a thing added after it; and therefore not as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, *even in our Covenanting with God*; for that Stipulation on the Childs part is paſt before: All that is mentioned in the Office of Baptiſme is, that the Child is Signed with the Sign of the Croſs, *in token that hereafter he ſhall not be aſhamed*, &c. So that it puts ſuch as have been formerly Baptized, in mind of that Duty which is incumben' on them, and to be a witneſs to every one of the Ingagements that lay on him. And that the Croſs may be thus uſed, will follow from Mr. *Baxters* Conceſſion, in the Third part of his *Chriſtian Directory*. Q. 113. Where he allows of the Uſe of the Croſs before *Heathen*, as a ſignification that we are not aſhamed of a Crucified Saviour: Now, if this Uſe of the Croſs be forbidden by the ſecond Commandment as a Tranſient Image; or if it be a Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace, it is ſo when uſed at other times as well as after the Sacrament of Baptiſm. The time or the place wherein it is uſed doth not alter the nature of the thing. If therefore he grants ſuch a Uſe of the Croſs, as St. *Auguſt. de Civitate Dei*, and other Antients mention, as in open Indication to Heathens, that we are not aſhamed of a Crucified Chriſt; and in civil

civil Uſes alſo, it may be as innocently uſed after Baptiſm, to the ſame end. And it may be obſerved, that in Adminiſtring the Sacrament of Baptiſm, it is ſaid by the Prieſt, *I Baptize thee*, &c. where he acts as Gods Miniſter, but in the Admiſſion of the Child, as a Member of the Congregation it is ſaid, *We receive this Child*, which cannot be thought any part of that Sacrament. But let us hear how Mr. *Baxter* reſolves the Queſtion, 49. *p.* 123. of Direct. *May one Offer his Child to be Baptized with the Sign of the Croſs, or the Uſe of Chryſme, the white Garment, Milk and Honey, or Exorciſme* (as among the *Lutherans*) *who taketh theſe to be unlawful things?* Anſw. *When he cannot lawfully have better, he may and muſt Offer his Child to them that will ſo Baptize him, rather than to worſe, or not at all; becauſe Baptiſm is Gods Ordinance, and the Childs privileage, and the Sin is the Miniſters and not his.* Another Mans ſinful Mode, will not juſtify the neglect of our Duty; elſe we might not joyn in Prayer or Sacraments, in which the Miniſter modally ~~ſinneth~~, that is with none. — The Parent may make known in ſuch Caſes, that it is Baptiſm he deſireth, and that he diſalloweth the manner, which he accounteth ſinful, and then he is no conſenter to it. But where the Law, or Scandal, or greater Inconveniencies forbid him, he is not to make his Profeſſion openly in the Congregation; but in that prudent manner which beſeemeth a ſober peaceable Perſon, whether the Miniſter in private, or to his neighbours in Converſe. Now when Mr. *Baxter* grants a Man may thus Offer his Child to Baptiſm, where he ſuppoſeth many unlawful things are Adminiſtred; he

ſins

doth very ill to amuſe the Laity with the bare Sign of the Croſs.

Yet I think if we take in the Doctrine and Practiſe of the Church, I may declare that it is certain by Gods Word, that Children ought to be Baptized: And it is obſervable that the Salvation of Baptized Infants dying, *&c.* was as generally Believed, as their right to Baptiſme. The Council of *Milevis*, which was Confirmed by the Sixth general Council, delivers this not only as their own Opinion, but as a Rule of the Catholick Church, *C.* 2. And St. *Auguſt. De Peccat. & Mer. l.* 3. *c.* 5. ſays, That of Old, the whole Church did firmly hold that Children do obtain Remiſſion of Original Sin by the Baptiſm of Chriſt; it would be tedious to quote the authority of the Fathers, who generally hold that the guilt contracted by the Firſt *Adam*, is done away in Baptiſm, which Ingrafts us into the Second *Adam*. This was the Doctrine of our Church ever ſince the Reformation, agreeing with the *Auguſtan*, *Saxon*, *Helvetick*, *Palatine*, *French* and *Scottiſh* Confeſſions. So that generally all that Aſſent to the Proteſtant Doctrine, do Aſſent to the Truth of this Rubrick, and ſeeing it is certain by the Word of God, that Baptiſm was Inſtituted for the Remiſſion of Sins, and to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace; ſeeing it is certain by the Word of God, as Mr. *Baxter* Aſſerts, that Infants have a right to Baptiſm; I ſee no cauſe why Mr. *Baxter* may not Aſſent to this Rubrick.

Our Wiſer Seniors ought to deal ſo candidly with young and unſtudied Divines, as to Interpret a Rubrick occaſionally delivered by them agreeably

greeably to thoſe other places, wherein this Doctrine of the Church to which they had formerly ſubſcribed, is purpoſely handled and explained; now, Article 25. concerning the Sacraments, the Church holds, "That in ſuch only as worthily "receive the ſame, they have a wholeſome Effect "and Operation. And Article 27. *Thoſe who receive Baptiſm rightly, are thereby, as by an Inſtrument, Grafted into the Church, and obtain Remiſſion of Sins.* Now as this may probably be the meaning of the Rubrick; ſo it is the ſenſe of all ſober Proteſtants, that all ſuch Infants as are duly Baptized, are admitted into the Covenant of Grace, and are in a State of Salvation. And this the Church of God hath alway taught, that none ſhall periſh for the Imputation of the Sin of the Firſt *Adam*, that are Baptized into the ſecond *Adam*; and unleſs Infants that dye ſhortly after their Baptiſm have this beneſit by it, we may turn *Anabaptiſts*, and deny it to them without any Injury.

But it is objected that neither Rubrick, nor Canon, except from Baptiſme and certainty of Salvation, any Children of Turks, Infidels, *&c. Anſw.* Mr. *Baxter* grants that as under the Old Teſtament, *Abraham* might cauſe the Children born in his Houſe, or bought with his Mony to be Circumciſed; ſo Chriſtian Proprietors may by themſelves, or other Godfathers, Offer ſuch Children to Baptiſm, and the benefits thereof. And *Fulgentius de Vera præd. l.* 1. *c.* 12. ſays, that if ſuch Infants die ſoon after Baptiſm, they are heirs of God, and Co-heirs with Chriſt. *Favores ſunt ampliandi.*

P. 174. It is Objected, that the Miniſters ſub-

ſcribing to uſe no other Form in the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, than what is injoyned by the Book of Common-Prayer, the Non-Conformiſts cannot Aſſent to it, leſt they ſhould refuſe from Baptiſm the Children of true Chriſtians, who will not procure Godfathers, nor ſubmit to the Sign of the Croſs; for *the Prieſt conſenteth*, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, p. 177. *Not to Baptize them, who dare not receive it with the Uſe of the Croſs and Godfathers.* Anſw. That as the Practice of our Church in one caſe of neceſſity, when Children are like to dye, ſhews that they approve of Baptiſm, without either Godfathers or the Sign of the Croſs; ſo it argues that they do approve of it in other caſes, where no contempt or ſcandal doth appear, (as where Godfathers may not be had, and it may be dangerous to uſe the Croſs as in the late times of confuſion) and thoſe perſons have a very low eſteem of the neceſſity and benefit of the Sacraments, as do withdraw themſelves and their Children from them, meerly on a Ceremony uſed in the Adminiſtration.

But the great fear of the Non-Conformiſts is, "leſt this Uſe of the Croſs be a ſecond Sa- "crament of the Covenant of Grace made by "Man, added to Baptiſm, — and the rather be- "cauſe it is the Uſe of an Image, though tran- "ſient in Gods Worſhip, and to ſuch high ends, "*p.* 180. *n.* 5. and the queſtion here, is whether "the Croſs be not here made (not only a Sacra- "ment in a larger Senſe, as Ordination and Ma- "trimony may be called Sacraments, but even) a "Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace. *Anſw.* I "perceive Mr. *Baxter* is none of the young un-

ſtudied

" ſtudied Divines in raiſing Scruples and Con-
" troverſie, which he hath as well multiply-
" ed in number, as aggravated in the nature of
" them.

It is yet a vainer Cavil which Mr. *Baxter* hath againſt thoſe Words in the Exhortation before the Communion; *That no Man ſhould come to the Holy Communion without a full Truſt in Gods Mercy, and with a quiet Conſcience:* Any Man that ſhall read the whole Period, will find this to be the ſenſe of it; that becauſe it is the duty of every one to come to that Holy Sacrament with a full Truſt in Gods Mercy, and a quiet Conſcience; Therefore ſuch whoſe fears are great, and their Faith but weak, whereby they might be hindered from not Communicating at all, or not with comfort; ſhould conſult their own, or ſome other able Paſtor for ſatisfying their doubts, removing their fears, and ſtrengthning their Faith in ſuch a meaſure, as that they may receive it for the better, and not for the worſe. If a ſerious Chriſtian ſhould complain to Mr. *Baxter* of the weakneſs of his Faith, and ſome troubles of Mind, I doubt not but that after Ghoſtly Counſel and Inſtruction, he would adviſe the ſame method, *viz.* to frequent the Holy Communion for the increaſe of his comfort, and ſtrengthening of his Faith. Suppoſe the caſe ſtood thus, That one who is afraid of Communicating with ſuch as he thinks to be wicked Perſons, or to receive the Sacrament kneeling, ſhould conſult with Mr. *Baxter*, whether he may Communicate according to the Order preſcribed in the Liturgy: I am much deceived if Mr. *Baxter* could not give him ſufficient reaſon to lay aſide thoſe doubts,

and rather than to neglect that Ordinance, to ſubmit to the Orders of the Church, and receive that Sacrament kneeling, and if it be no Sin to receive it, it is none to give it to one that kneels; nor is it any way inconvenient for ſcrupulous perſons to ſeek Reſolution and Conſolation from ſome able Miniſter of the Church.

P. 184. *N.* 15. Mr. *Baxter* obſerves, that by the Liturgy every Pariſhioner is to Communicate twice a year; the Rubrick ſays three times in the year, whereof *Eaſter* is to be one. As for the compelling Men ſo to do, that is, as he obſerves, by Statute, and therefore it concerns not the Conforming Miniſters; ſo that this will not amount to what Mr. *Baxter* reports, as if it were the Voice of the Miniſter. — *Receive the Sacrament, or lye in Goal.* But Mr. *Baxter* ought to have underſtood this Rubrick, *cum grano Salis*, if he had ſo much left; for it could not be ſtrictly underſtood of every Pariſhioner, but only of ſuch as ſhould be judged fit and duly qualifyed; not to every Child, or ignorant Perſon, ſeeing it directs that ſuch as are admitted to that Sacrament, ſhould be able to give an account of the *Catechiſm*, and be actually *Confirmed*, or deſirous of Confirmation.

And the Curate is to have notice at leaſt the day before who intend to Communicate, and if any of them be a *notorious evil-liver*, *or have done any wrong to his Neighbour by Word or Deed, whereby the Congregation is offended, or if the Curate perceive any to live in malice and hatred*, he may not only *admoniſh* them to forbear the Lords Table, but not *ſuffer* them to be partakers thereof, till he know them to be reconciled.

But

But into what deplorable times are we fallen, that our higheſt *Priviledge* ſhould be accounted a great *Grievance*, and when all things are prepared and we are *Invited in the Name of Chriſt* to *come* to his Supper, we do rather chooſe Impriſonment and Goals, rather than the Table of the Lord? The Firſt Chriſtians made this Sacrament their *Daily-Bread*, which Devout Practice was continued for many years, till as Devotion waxed colder, they Communicated only once a *Week*, or on *Sundays* and *Holydays* at moſt; at laſt they came to once a *Year*, until it was Decreed by ſome Councils, that they ſhould receive *at leaſt three times*. By the Liturgy of *Edward* the VI. the *Clergy in Collegiate Churches* and *Cathedrals* were to receive *Daily*; and by the preſent Liturgy every *Sunday*. But that Heavenly Ordinance, which the Primitive Chriſtians begged on their Knees, and which is a moſt excellent means to Unite us to Chriſt, and to one another, is deſpiſed and made a ground of Strife and Diviſion. And when, notwithſtanding the pious Proviſion made by the Church to qualify its Members for a due and *frequent Participation* of that Bleſſing; and the Penalties provided by Law for ſuch as neglect this duty, there is ſo miſerable a neglect of it; we may juſtly fear, that if theſe methods be diſuſed, we ſhall return to the practice of the late times of Reformation, where that Sacred Ordinance was in very many Pariſhes wholly neglected for ſome years together.

P. 187. Mr. *Baxter* excepts againſt thoſe words in the Office for Burial. *Foraſmuch as it hath pleaſed Almighty God, to take to himſelf the Soul of our Dear*

Dear Brother here departed. Which he takes in a ſtrict ſenſe, as implying the Salvation of the Deceaſed, when it may be underſtood only in a larger ſenſe; that as the Body returns to the Earth, ſo doth the Soul return to God that gave it to be by him diſpoſed of. And therefore the Church ſays only of the Soul, that it is here departed, that is, gone from the Body unto God the Judge of all Men; and when at the Interring of the Body, it is ſaid, *In hope of the Reſurrection to Eternal Life*, it is not ſaid particularly of his Reſurrection, but more generally that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of our Bodies to Eternal Life in the ſenſe as it is taken by Expoſitors of the Creed, that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of our Bodies to Eternal Life; when they that have done well come forth to the Reſurrection of the Juſt, and they that have done evil to Condemnation.

Of this as we expreſs a *ſure and certain hope* for our ſelves, and all that do depart in the true Faith; ſo, when we apply it particularly to the party Deceaſed, we ſay only our hope is that he *reſteth in Chriſt.* And Chriſtian Charity teacheth us to *hope* the beſt of all that dye in the Communion of the Church. For as thoſe that dye Excommunicate, the Office of Burial is denyed to them; And ſeeing Mr. *Baxter* pleads, that ſome upright Chriſtians in Phrenſies, Melancholies and Diſtractions make away themſelves, of whom he would have us to entertain this hope: It would puzle a more charitable Man than he, to reſolve of any particular Man that dyeth in the Communion of the Church, that there is no hope of his Salvation; and it is better to err on the right hand

hand in Judging Charitably, than through Pride or Malice to condemn a Brother; our Saviour forbidding us to Judge that we be not Judged.

His next Exception is againſt theſe Words, *We give thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleaſed thee to deliver this our Brother, out of the miſeries of this ſinful World.* Now it being certain to us, that Death doth put an end to a State of Sin and Miſery, to which all are ſubject in this Life; we ought doubtleſs to give God thanks for that which we know to be a Mercy, and to leave the Final Determination of his Soul, (which is a ſecret unto us) to God. There was no Sin in *Jobs bleſſing the Name of the Lord*; when by a ſevere Providence he took away his Children amidſt their Mirth, not in another paſſage which is uſed alſo in this Office, and ſpoken by the Apoſtle concerning the *Corinthians*: *Thanks be to God who hath given us the Victory through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; and when we ſee our Friends and Relations peaceably departed; we may bleſs God for his Mercy, in delivering them from the evils which they ſuffered, and hope that he hath given them reſt in Chriſt; and we do but our duty to God, and ſhew our Charity to our Brother in ſo doing.

P. 190. The Surplice is accounted by ſome *Non-Conformiſts* to be unlawful, and therefore they cannot Aſſent to the Uſe of it: For which no reaſon is given, only Mr. *Baxter* ſays, "If a Man "miſtakingly ſhould take the Uſe of the Surplice "to be ſinful, he ſhould not therefore be ſilenced. "*Anſw.* If he do miſtake, he ought to do it mo"deſtly, ſuſpecting his own Judgment which he "will find to be contrary to that liberty which "Chriſt

" Chriſt hath purchaſed for us, that to the pure " all things are pure, and contrary to the Practice " of Primitive times, wherein the *White Garment* " was in Uſe, by the Teſtimonies of St. *Hierom*, " *Chryſoſtome* and *Auguſtine*, contrary to the " Judgment of the moſt Learned Proteſtants, and " of Mr. *Baxter* himſelf. In his Five Diſputations, " p. 409. *Some decent habit is neceſſary, the Magi-* " *ſtrate, Miniſters, or Aſſociated Paſtors, muſt deter-* " *mine what* ——*if they tye all to one Habit (and ſup-* " *poſe it were an indecent habit) yet this is but an* " *imprudent Uſe of Power, it is a thing within* " *the Magiſtrates reach, he doth not an Aliene* " *Work, but his own Work amiſs. And therefore* " *the thing in it ſelf being lawful, I would Obey* " *him, and uſe that Garment if I could not be diſpen-* " *ſed with. Yea, though ſecundarily the whiteneſs be* " *to ſignify purity, and ſo it be made a Teaching Sign,* " *yet would I obey.* Now if any Man againſt all this Authority and Arguments of Mr. *Baxter* and others, ſhould ſtill think the Surplice unlawful, it is better that he ſhould be ſilenced, than the Churches Peace and Order be diſturbed, or Ancient Laws abrogated, as oft as ſome (miſtaking) think them unlawful; it is diſobedience which the Church doth cenſure, and the Law puniſh. The Surplice is but a Ceremony, which ought not to weigh down the Duty of Obedience.

P. 191. Mr. *Baxter* grants, that if the Athanaſian Creed be referred to the Doctrine of the Trinity, it would not be excepted againſt. For he takes it to be the beſt Explication of the Myſtery of the Sacred Trinity, which in ſo ſhort a Sum is extant in the Church: So that by requiring

Aſſent

Aſſent and Conſent thereunto, the Church of *England* hath ſecured her ſelf againſt any ſuſpition of Socinian or Anti-Trinitarian Doctrin, whereof Mr. *Baxter* and others frequently and falſly accuſe the Conformiſts. That which cannot be Aſſented to, is the Damnatory Sentences in that Creed; as,

Firſt, Where it is ſaid in the beginning, *Whoſoever will be ſaved, before all things it is neceſſary that he hold the Catholick Faith.* —— *And the Catholick Faith is this*, &c. And in the end, *This is the Catholick Faith, which except a Man believe faithfully he cannot be ſaved.* Anſwer, if our Aſſent be required only to the Uſe of this Creed, and not to a *belief* of the Truth of every part of it, the controverſie will be at an end.

Secondly, The Belief of things as neceſſary to Salvation, is granted by Non-conformiſts to be not an Aſſent to the ſeveral *Phraſes* and *obſcure Words*; but to the general ſenſe contained in them. Now the ſenſe of our Church in propoſing this Creed, may be judged by the Uſe which ſhe makes of the Apoſtles Creed, not only in the daily Profeſſion of it, but in the Office of Baptiſm, as containing all the neceſſary points of Faith, into which we are Baptized: And in the Catechiſm as containing all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, which doth ſhew that no more is required as neceſſary to Salvation, than what is contained in the Apoſtles Creed.

Thirdly, In this Creed ſome things are propounded as neceſſary points of Faith, which Men of weak judgments may apprehend, as that *we Worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.*

Other

Other things are for a clearer explication of that Doctrin, and vindication of it from the errors that were then risen in the Church, as the *Arrians* and *Nestorians* who erred concerning the Divinity of Christ and his two Natures; which begin thus: *For there is one Person of the Father*, &c. After which followeth the necessary Doctrine again: *So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity is to be Worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.* So that the Doctrine of the Trinity is that Faith which is proposed as necessary to Salvation. I know the exception of many against this Creed is in relation to the Heathen, who seem by it to be excluded from Salvation. In which respect, I suppose it is that Mr. *Baxter* says, *p.* 191. That some R. Reverend Conformists do profess that those Sentences are untrue, and not to be approved; and he instanceth somewhere in Mr. *Chillingworths* refusal to subscribe it. But if this be the ground of the Exception, I conceive that the generality of the Non-conformists who maintain the same Opinion, which is consonant to the Scriptures, and to the Assemblies Confession of Faith; to which Mr. *Baxter* also hath declared his Assent in this particular, will not oppose. For in the Assemblies Confession, *C.* 10. Article 4. concerning *effectual calling*, they say, *That Men not professing the Christian Religion, cannot be saved in any way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their Lives according to the Light of Nature, and the Law of that Religion they do profess, and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested.* And I know some Non-conformists have

have lately blamed ſome Conformiſts for ſeeming to incline to the contrary Opinion. Which, if this be ſenſe of the Creed our Church doth explode; yet ſome Non-conformiſts think that by holding the Doctrine of the Athanaſian Creed, they do not judge the Heathen World, and that they dobut not, but *in every nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteouſneſs is accepted of him*; ſo that this obloquie is ſilenced. But it is moſt probable, that *Athanaſius* intended the Explanatory part of the Creed againſt the *Arrians* and other *Hereticks* in the Church, who if they denied the Divinity of Chriſt, and dyed in that error; who can think they can be ſaved? ſeeing they make Chriſt a meer Creature, and overthrow the Doctrine of our Redemption by him: But that he ſhould condemn all that have a true, though but a weak Faith in the Holy Trinity, and cannot comprehend the manner of the Eternal Generation of the Son, the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, and the Co-equality of the *Trinity*, cannot be thought to have been the Mind of *Athanaſius*.

P. 192. *N.* 20. The Liturgy ſaith, *All Prieſts and Deacons are to ſay daily the Morning and Evening Prayer privately or openly, not being lett by ſickneſs or ſome other urgent cauſe* &c. *Anſw.* That the Primitive Chriſtians did meet daily, not only for publick Prayers, but to receive the Sacrament is believed; and that it is our duty to Pray Morning and Evening cannot be denyed, and what ſhould hinder, but that ſuch as are ſpecially devoted to the Service of God, ſhould Pray openly *with* the people, if not reaſonably hindred, or at leaſt pray privately

privately for them? there are many that do their duty herein, and if all did, it would be better with us; becauſe all Men do not perform their Baptiſmal Vows, is it fit that none ſuch ſhould be made? we ſee this duty is performed in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and in many other places, where there is a liberal maintenance provided for the *Prieſts* and *Deacons*, where though one only do Officiate, yet all thoſe that are preſent may ſay the daily Prayers as the Liturgy requires, which is another frivolous Objection of Mr. *Baxters*, p. 192. n. 3.

The next is a Calumny againſt the whole Liturgy, *viz.* that the Prayers are diſorderly and defective, not Formed according to the Order of Matter, nor of the Lords Prayer; but like an immethodical Sermon which is unſuitable to the High Subjects, and Honorable Work of Holy Worſhip, and that the Non-conformiſts have Offered (when it ſhall be well accepted) to give in a Catalogue of the diſorders and defects of the Liturgy. But all this notwithſtanding, they think it lawful to Uſe the Liturgy in Obedience or for Unity, or when no better may be Uſed: It is ſomething to go thus far, but if they would impartially conſider the defects and confuſions which were in the *Directory*, as it hath been conſidered by Doctor *Hammond*, or in Mr. *Baxters* Eight days exploit for a more *correct Nepenthes*, and ſhall on the other ſide read that account which Mr. *Comber*, and others have given of the Methodical order and dependance of the ſeveral Prayers and Offices, the Grave and Scriptural Phraſes and Expreſſions in the Liturgy; he may perceive that this

is

is fitter to guide the Devotion of the Universal Church, than those other are for Country Conventicles.

P. 194. He excepts against the Preface to the Book of Ordination, where it is said, that —— *It is evident to all Men diligently reading Holy Scripture, and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these Orders in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, as several Offices.* Answ. I shall not trouble my Readers with the Arguments of Learned Men, for the Order of Bishops in the Church ever since the Apostles days as distinct from Presbyters; much less shall I repeat those uncomely Reflections, which Mr. *Baxter* hath made on Diocesan Bishops in both his late Books. It may suffice in Answer to this Objection, that Mr. *Baxter* hath been formerly of a contrary perswasion, I do not mean only when he was Ordained by a Bishop, and did, or ought to swear Canonical Obedience to him, as his Lawful Governour; but in his more mature and serious Age, when he had studied the controversie; I mean in his *Christian Directory*, p. 127. part 7. Where having proved the particular Orders of Presbyters, and Deacons: He gives his reasons for a *larger Episcopacy*, as the Margin tells you. And *N.* 4. Thus he says, —— *Besides this, in the Apostles days, there were under Christ in the Universal Church, many general Officers that had the care of Governing, and Overseeing Churches up and down, and were fixed by stated relation unto none. Such were the Apostles, Evangelists, and many of their helpers in their days. And most Christian Churches think that though the Apostolical, extraordinary Gifts, Priviledges and Offi-*

ces ceaſe; yet Government being an ordinary part of their work, the ſame Forms of Government, which Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt did ſettle in the firſt Age, were ſettled for all following Ages, though not with the ſame extraordinary gifts and adjuncts: Becauſe, 1. *We read of the ſettling of that Form,* viz. *General Officers as well as Particular, but we never read of any Abolition, Diſcharge, or Ceſſation of the Inſtitution.* 2. *Becauſe if we affirm a Ceſſation without proof, we ſeem to accuſe God of Mutability, as ſettling one Form of Government for one Age only, and no longer.* 3. *And we leave room for audacious Wits accordingly to queſtion other Goſpel-Inſtitutions, as Paſtors, Sacraments,* &c. *and to ſay that they were but for an Age.* 4. *It was General Officers that Chriſt promiſed to be with to the end of the World.* Matth. 28. 20. *Now this will hold true or not* (ſays Mr. *Baxter*) *If not, then this general Miniſtry is to be numbred with humane Additions to be next treated of. If it do, then there is another part of the Form of Government proved to be of Divine Inſtitution: I ſay not another Church, but another part of the Government of both Churches, Univerſal and Particular; becauſe ſuch General Officers are ſo in the Univerſal, as to have a general Overſight of the particular: As an Army is Headed only by the General himſelf, and a Regiment by the Colonel, and a Troop by the Captain, but the General Officers of the Army, as the Lieutenants General, the Majors General,* &c. *are under the Lord General, in and over the Army, and have a general over-ſight of the particular Bodies, (Regiments and Troops) Now if this be the Inſtituted Form of Chriſts Church-Government, that he himſelf rule abſolutely as General, and that he have ſome General Officers under him,*

him, (not any one having the charge of the whole; but in the whole unfixedly, or as they voluntarily part their Provinces) and that each particular Church have their own proper Paſtor, one or more; then who can ſay, that no Form of Church Government is of Divine appointment or command? So far Mr. *Baxter*, with whom I find other Non-conformiſts to agree in the Notion of Dioceſan Biſhops; which is enough not only to confute this Objection againſt the Order of Biſhops, but all that Mr. *Baxter* hath ſaid in his late Writing, againſt the Conſtitution of National Churches, and the Government of Dioceſans, with ſo much partiality and paſſion. And though Mr. *Baxter* deny it here, that *having diligently read the Holy Scriptures, and Ancient Authors, yet Three Orders and Offices are not evident to him*; yet it is evident, he hath proved it ſolidly enough, even from the Scripture alone, to which whoever ſhall joyn the Practice and Teſtimony of the Primitive Church, as a help to explain the ſenſe of the Scripture, muſt needs be perſwaded of the Truth of theſe Three Orders in the Church of Chriſt; and therefore this Objection, from the Preface to the Book of Ordination, is of no weight.

In all the fardle of Mr. *Baxters* impertinencies, there is not a more trifling Objection than that which follows againſt the Biſhops inviting the people in the Name of God to come forth, and ſhew what Crime or Impediment they know in the Perſons to be Ordained, *p.* 196. For ſeeing no Perſon is to be Ordained without a Title to ſome Cure; ſeeing there are ſolemn days ſet apart for Ordination, and Prayers ordered to be

Uſed the preceding Week-days, for Gods Bleſſing on that Ordinance; ſeeing every Perſon is to produce Teſtimonials under the hands of Three Perſons, to whom he is known, of his Life and Converſation; ſeeing any perſon may, if he pleaſe, be preſent at the Ordination, and the Biſhop may perſonally enquire into his Miniſterial abilities: I know not what further caution is neceſſary than to pronounce a Liberty to the people, who generally meet on that occaſion in the greateſt Congregations, and in publick Places, to come forth and ſhew if they know any impediment in the Perſon to be Ordained; upon which, I my ſelf have known ſeveral Perſons to be repulſed in the Face of the Congregation; and when the Ordained Perſon is to continue a Deacon, for a year before he is admitted a Presbyter, the people have a competent time to inform the Biſhop of any Crime that they know by him, which may render him an unfit Perſon, without ſuch a call from the Biſhop; which is but *Abundans Cautela.*

P. 197. He objects againſt theſe words, in the Form of Conſecration. *Receive the Holy Ghoſt, for the Office and Work of a Prieſt*, &c. The doubt is, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, whether this be not an *abuſe of the words which Chriſt himſelf, or his Apoſtles uſed, and ſo not to be Aſſented to.* Now Mr. *Baxter* grants that Chriſt or his Apoſtles uſed theſe words; that our Saviour uſed them, and when is very obſervable. It was after his Reſurrection, and before his Aſcenſion, that our Saviour endowed his Apoſtles with this Miniſterial Power, ſaying unto them, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, which could not be meant of any extraordinary Power of Tongues

and

and Miracles, which were not given till Chriſt was firſt glorified, when the Day of Pentecoſt was fully come. The Power therefore conveyed by theſe words, was an Authorizing of them to the ordinary work of the Miniſtry, as the following words do inforce; *whoſe Sins ye remit, they are remitted*; and this Power Mr. *Baxter* grants to belong to every Miniſter: That the Apoſtles of our Lord did uſe the ſame words, is probable from that expreſſion of St. *Paul*, *Acts*, 20. 28. *Take heed to your ſelves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you over-ſeers.* And Mr. *Baxter* complains, that *too little notice is taken of the Holy Ghoſts ſetting Paſtors over the Flocks, which the Scripture mentioneth*, p. 310. *Which is a conveying of that Authority, which Chriſt at his Aſcenſion left to his Church; he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets*, &c. *for the work of the Miniſtry*, Eph. 4. 11, 12. v. 13. *Till we all come in the Unity of the Faith*, &c.

P. 198. He excepts againſt the Oath of the Biſhops to their Metropolitan, and *p.* 199. the Oath of the Prieſts and Deacons for Canonical Obedience to their Dioceſan; againſt which he gives no reaſon, but argues negatively, that it was not Inſtituted by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. But Mr. *Baxter* having granted a like Sub-ordination of Offices in the Church, as in an Army; I ſee no Reaſon, but that when authority injoyns it: as a Captain may ſwear Obedience to his Colonel, and he to his Lieutenant General, or Major Generals; ſo may the Presbiter to his Dioceſan, and the Dioceſan to his Metropolitan. But Mr. *Baxter* hath more plainly reſolved this doubt, in anſwer to Q. 152. in his *Directory*, part the 3*d*. *p.* 181. the

Queſtion is, —— *May we lawfully ſwear Obedience in all lawful things to Uſurpers, or to our lawful Paſtors?* To which under *N.* 3. he thus anſwers, *The old Non-conformiſts, who thought the* Engliſh *Prelacy an unlawful Office; yet maintained that it is lawful to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience, becauſe they thought it was impoſed by the King and Laws; and that we ſwore to them not as Officers, claiming a Divine Right in the Spiritual Government, but as Ordinaries or Officers made by the King,* N.B. *to exerciſe ſo much of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction under him as he can delegate.* —— *And if Prelacy were proved never ſo unlawful, no doubt but by the Kings command we may ſwear, or perform formal Obedience to a Prelate, as he is the Kings Officer. Of the Non-conformiſts Judgment in this, read* Bradſhaw *againſt* Canne. This conceſſion of Mr. *Baxter* will overthrow that, wherein he placeth the force of the Objection, *viz. That the Ordinary is not only the Biſhop, but alſo the Chancellour, Officials,* &c. *becauſe they are the Kings Officers.* And, *if the Chancellour do invade the Office of the Miniſtry in Excommunications and Abſolutions;* Mr. *Baxter* well obſerves, p. 202. *It is not juſtifyed by the Biſhops themſelves.* I wonder how any right Presbyterian can except againſt one Lay-Chancellour in a Dioceſs, who would ſet up one or more Un-ordained Ruling Elders in every Pariſh; and though Mr. *Baxter* be not thorow Paced in this point, yet in his Tract of *Ordination*, he would have the Magiſtrate to authorize a *Lay-Officer*, well like to our *Chancellours*, p. 299. He directs the Magiſtrate to *appoint an able Godly moderate Miniſter in each County, or half, or quarter, to ſee the Paſtors do their duty, not having*

having Epiſcopal Power to ſuſpend or excommunicate them; but let every Viſitor have an Agent of the Magiſtrates joyned with him, Armed with Authority to convent the Miniſters, and examine Witneſſes, and to do what more the Chief Magiſtrate ſhall ſee meet, ſo that ſtill theſe two Viſitors go together, and let the Civil Viſitor have all the Coercive Power. This comes home to our *Lay-Chancellours*, who being the Kings Officer, we may by Mr. *Baxters* permiſſion ſwear Obedience to him. And other Non-Conformiſts (as wiſe as Mr. *Baxter*) think that the Apoſtles Wiſe Man ſpoken of in 1 *Cor.* 6. to be a Preſident for our Chancellours. And it is ſtrange that they who would ſet two Lay-Ruling Elders in every Pariſh, ſhould not admit one in a Dioceſs.

Mr. *Baxters* laſt quarrel againſt the Rubrick is, that it obligeth the Miniſter, who repelleth any from the Sacrament to give an account of the ſame, to the Ordinary within fourteen days after. *Anſw.* He that hath no notorious ſcandalous perſons in his Pariſh, is free from this trouble; and ſo is he that hath ſuch, if they do not preſs themſelves on that Holy Communion. If any ſuch do, the Miniſter having timely notice of his intention, as is required, may ſend for him, and privately admoniſh him, that the Congregation are much offended by his diſorderly Converſation; eſpecially by ſuch or ſuch a Crime, whereof by common Fame he is reported guilty, and therefore deſire him to forbear that Sacrament, till ſuch time as he have given Teſtimony of his Repentance and Reformation, to the ſatisfaction of the Congregation. In this caſe the party forbearing

on a private Admonition, there is no need of informing the Ordinary. But if ſuch a perſon ſtill preſs on, the Miniſter ought to refuſe him, and it will much abate his trouble, and the *Odium* which otherwiſe might lye on him, to refer the Caſe to the Ordinary to be determined by him.

Theſe are the great number of Sins, hindring Conformity, ſo hainous as that Mr. *Baxter* was afraid to name them, leſt he ſhould diſpleaſe and provoke the Conformiſts; which even in the judgment of Mr. *Baxter* himſelf, and other ſerious Non-conformiſts, will ſcarce amount to an appearance of evil. As for the Objections againſt the Declarations, and Oaths required by Act of Parliament; ſeeing he acknowledgeth that it is not the ſenſe of the Liturgy, but of a Statute of Parliament which the Non-conformiſts doubt of, and that it would be impertinent for us to tell them what is the ſenſe of the Church; the doubt being, what is the ſenſe of the Parliament, *p.* 191. I ſhall not add much more to what I have ſpoken on thoſe Subjects, but refer them to thoſe, to whom the Execution of thoſe Laws are committed for their better Inſtruction. And I ſhall only obſerve, that the complaint againſt the Lawgivers, *p.* 204. *n.* 3. is, that they will not *otherwiſe expound their own words, after ſeventeen years waiting for it under compulſive executions.* By (*otherwiſe*) he means againſt the ſenſe of the plain words, as appears, *n.* 2. in which the Non-conformiſts there profeſs to underſtand them, but cannot Aſſent to them, and therefore they think they may be excuſed, if by miſtake they think ſome of thoſe paſſages to be unlawful, that are not, or to

have

have a worſe ſenſe than indeed they have. This miſtake will appear to the Judicious Reader to be wilful, and an Act of pure malice and revenge. For the plain *Engliſh* of it is this, That becauſe the Parliament will not, in favour to the Non-conformiſts, alter their Laws, and diſpenſe with the Oaths of Obedience, and renouncing of the Covenant, and reforming every thing in the Liturgy which they have fancied to be ſinful, and thereby juſtify the Non-conformiſts, and confeſs themſelves to be the cauſe of our preſent Diviſions: They are ſtill reſolved to pronounce the Liturgy to be ſinful, the Laws Tyrannical, and ſuch as would force them to perjury. And though they want power for the preſent to help themſelves, yet if you will not hear, thoſe will, whom God will uſe to the healing of his Churches (as he ſays in his Preface) the meaning whereof is too plain: By this time the Reader may diſcern how vain-glorious his boaſt is, that he hath ſhewn us *a righter way of Concord, more Divine, Sure, Harmleſs, Comprehenſive, fitted by Chriſt himſelf, to the intereſt of all good Men; yea, of the Church, and all the World.* Would you know, what that grand diſcovery is he tells you, *p.* 36. of his Plea, which is the Sum of his five firſt Sections; and this is the reſult of all. "If "every Paſtor might be a Biſhop in his Pariſh, "Independent and free from any Superiour to con-"troul him; if he may have an arbitrary power, "if they may be arbitrary in exerciſe of the pow-"er of the Keys without appeal, ſuch as he ſays, "*p.*265. the Jews had, where there was a Village "of Ten Perſons, there was a Presbyter that had "power of Judging Offenders: Then we ſhould

be

"be ſo far (ſays he) from uſing the controver-
"ſie about the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, as a
"diſtinct Order from Presbyters, to any Schiſme
"or injury to the Church, (as hitherto they have
"done) that we ſhould thankfully contribute our
"beſt endeavours to the Concord, Peace, Safety,
"and Proſperity thereof (*i. e.*) they would give
the Biſhops leave to exerciſe their Authority in
Utopia, having provided that they ſhall have no-
thing to do in *England:* But the Magiſtrates muſt
yield to them alſo. —"Might we be freed from
"Swearing, Subſcribing, Declaring and Covenant-
"ing unneceſſary things, which we take not to
"be true, and from ſome few unneceſſary pra-
"ctices which we cannot juſtify: And if they
might have power of Ordaining ſuch as they
pleaſe, and of Confirming the Adult not accor-
ding to the Order of the Church of *England* (for
that comes too near to Popery;) "but accor-
"ding to Mr. *Baxters*, or Mr. *Hanmers* Model, that
"is, May the power of altering the Laws in
"Church and State, then, (and not till then,
"when theſe neceſſary terms are granted) they
"will ſerve the Church (ſo modelled) in poverty
"and raggs. But of ſo great a mercy (ſays he)
"experience hath made our hopes from Men to
"be very ſmall; and the Reaſon of the thing
"makes our hopes as ſmall, of the happineſs of
"the Church of *England*, till God Unite us on
"theſe neceſſary terms. To what great ſtreights
do ſome Men reduce themſelves, that they cannot
live unleſs they Rob and ruine their neighbours,
ſubvert whole Churches, and Kingdoms, and
graſp all Power and Authority, over the Bodies
and

and Conſciences of their Brethren into their own hands?

Did ever any Biſhop aſpire to ſuch Tyranny as this? (the Pope only excepted) is not the King and whole Nation greatly Culpable, not to truſt themſelves with the Ingenuity of this people, of whoſe Loyalty and Charity they have had ſuch experience? and is it not pitty that they ſhould be conſtrained to attempt theſe things againſt Law, when they ſo humbly deſire to have them eſtabliſhed by Law? and when the reaſon of the thing, (*i. e.*) their reſolution to have it ſo, (it being their great concern as he calls it) makes the hopes of the happineſs of the Church of *England* to be very ſmall, which Men ſo reſolved as they are may foretel, as Mr. *Baxter* doth without a Spirit of Prophecy.

Sect. 2. *p.* 207. Mr. *Baxter* proceeds to the ſecond part of Conformity, which he calls *Re-ordination*, and ſays, *it was either intended as a ſecond Ordination, or not; If yea, it is a thing condemned by the ancient Churches, by the Canons called the Apoſtles*, &c. *If not, then they take ſuch Mens former Ordination to be Null, and conſequently all ſuch Churches to be no Churches, their Baptizings and Conſecration of the Lords Supper*, &c. *to be Null. Anſw.* Although the Ordination by Presbyters alone, eſpecially when it hath been done in oppoſition to, and *Contempt* of Biſhops, hath been ever condemned in the Church, and the validity thereof is ſtill queſtioned; yet granting it to be valid, a Submiſſion to Epiſcopal Ordination, is no renouncing

* P. 237. *of the five Diſputations. We Ordain not* preſente, *but* Spreto Epiſcopo.

nouncing of that which was performed by Presbyters, no more than the ſubmiſſion of the Diſciples of *John*, who had been Baptized by him with the Baptiſm of Repentance, to the Baptiſm of Chriſt, Nor doth the Law any where require them to declare that their former Ordination was Null; becauſe then it would have pronounced their Baptizings, and other Miniſterial Offices to be Null; if therefore we did juge as charitably of our Legiſlators as we ought, and Interpret the Laws by the practice, we cannot find any ſuch thing as Re-ordination intended. For firſt, the word is no where mentioned, but the Ordination required is to qualify them for the exerciſe of their Miniſtry in the Church of *England*, and to capacitate them for it. Thus in the Preface to the *Book of Ordination*, it is ſaid, *None ſhall be taken as Miniſters of the Church of* England, *but who are ſo Ordained.*

It denyeth not, but they may be Miniſters elſewhere, and the Act for *Uniformity* renders them uncapable of any Parſonage, Vicaridge, *&c. in the Church of* England. But the ſame Act allows of the Miniſters Presbyterially Ordained in *other Reformed Churches*, to exerciſe their Miniſtry here by His Majeſties Authority. Yea, the ſame Parliament permits them to meet, and exerciſe many Miniſterial duties; ſo that the number above that of their own Families do not exceed *Five*, and Mr. *Baxter* knows, that the moſt eminent Divines of our Church, ever held the Ordination by Preſbyters in forraign Churches to be lawful.

2. It is Mr. *Baxters* Opinion, that the outward part

part of Ordination may be repeated. *Directory l.* 3. Q. 21.

And that the Ordainer doth but Miniſterially inveſt the perſon with Power, whom the Spirit of God hath qualified for it by the Inward Call; now the *Inward Call* being the Eſſential part (as he accounts) and the Miniſterial Inveſtiture of the perſon with power, being the outward part. *P.*311. of the Plea; I ſee no reaſon why one Ordained by Presbyters, may not ſubmit to Epiſcopal Ordination by his own Argument. Yea, Mr. *Baxter* there affirmes, *That the mutual conſent of the people, and themſelves may ſuffice to the orderly admittance into the Office; eſpecially if the Magiſtrate conſent, and the Ordainers ſhould refuſe:* For which ſee more in his *Diſpute* of *Ordination*, from whence I propoſe this caſe; ſuppoſe a perſon fitly qualified for Parts and Piety, Choſen and Ordained a Miniſter by an Independent, or Anabaptiſtical people, ſhould afterward ſubmit himſelf to Preſbyterial Ordination: I doubt not but the Presbyters would think it lawful to Ordain him, and I believe they would not admit him into their Churches without ſuch Ordination, which may juſtifie our Superiours in requiring that they who will be admitted Miniſters of the Church of *England*, ſhould be Epiſcopally Ordained. For here is nothing repeated but the *outward part*, or Ceremony of *Inveſtiture*, which by Mr. *Baxters* Confeſſion may be repeated, and is no more than the Marriage of ſuch by a Miniſter, who had been Married before by a Juſtice of Peace: Or as he makes another Compariſon, it is no more than if a perſon very expert in Phyſick, ſhould practice with-

without a Licenſe. Upon which he tells you a ſtory of his great ſucceſs in Phyſick, which he practiced many years *gratis*, and ſaved the Lives of multitudes, *p.* 78. of the Third part of the way of Concord; and yet he there grants, that it is meet for the ſafety of Mens Health, that none practiſe Phyſick, but a Licenſed Phyſician. And until there be a greater want of Divines or Phyſicians than now there is, it is pitty that ſuch as are not Licenſed ſhould be permitted.

The Third part of Conformity begins *p.* 208. concerning the Renunciation of the Covenant, whereof he treats, §. 11. and 12. *Miniſters* (ſaith he) *muſt onely ſubſcribe, that there is no Obligation on me, or any other perſon from the Oath*, &c. *to endeavour any change or alteration of Government in the Church*, to which he adds the *Oxford* Oath, *That we will never endeavour any alteration.* And the Articles for *Prelacy*, the *Ordination promiſe*, and *Oath of Canonical Obedience.* "Againſt all which he "Objects, that even thoſe Non-conformiſts that "are for the lawfulneſs; yea, the need and de-"ſireableneſs of *Biſhops* and *Arch-biſhops* are unſa-"tisfied in theſe things: That ſome Hundred of "Pariſhes are without any particular appropriate "Biſhops, and conſequently are without the Diſci-"pline of ſuch Biſhops, and ſo are no Churches "but only parts of a Dioceſan Church, that the "Biſhops have more work than they can do, and "the Keys are to be exerciſed by Lay-men. *Anſw.* I have already ſhewed Mr. *Baxters* judgment of Biſhops and Lay-Chancellours, and ſhall only add, that the Laws which Impower the Miniſtry with the Exerciſe of Diſcipline are ſo full,

and

and exact, that if each Miniſter did faithfully perform his duty, there would be no need to complain for want of work, or of authority to do it effectually. Every Miniſter is to admoniſh his Pariſhioners not to delay the Baptiſm of their Children, whereby they are entred into a Covenant with God, and by their Sureties ingaged to Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience; as ſoon as they come to years of Diſcretion, they are to be inſtructed out of the Church Catechiſm every *Sunday*, which Catechiſm Mr. *Baxter* himſelf commends to be better for its Method than moſt others: Then upon their knowledg of the Principles of Religion, and owning their Baptiſmal Vows, whereof the Miniſter is to take cognizance, and certify to the Biſhop they are to be Confirmed; and none but ſuch are to be admitted Communicants, and none but Communicants to be admitted as Godfathers, &c. The Miniſter ought both publickly and privately to admoniſh ſuch as are ſcandalous, and to deny them the Communion, until they manifeſt their Repentance, which is a kind of Excommunication. He is conſtantly to Celebrate publick Worſhip, to Preach the Word of God, and Adminiſter the Holy Sacraments frequently; to viſit his Pariſhioners, that he may know the State of his Flock, to inſtruct the Ignorant, rebuke the Wicked, incourage the Good, to viſit the Sick, abſolve the Penitent, and to ſtrengthen them by the Word of God, and the Comforts of the Holy Sacrament againſt the fear of death. If theſe things were duly done as they might and ought to be; there would be no cauſe to complain, either that the Biſhop hath too much,

or

or the Paſtor too little work, the fault is not in the Laws or Conſtitution of Government, but in the want of due Execution.

To omit the many impertinencies in the 12. §. there are Three things only, on which he grounds his Plea for the Covenant: The Firſt is, *p.* 214. "Whether when *Charles* the II. had (though in-"juriouſly) been drawn to take the Covenant, it "doth not oblige thoſe that took it afterward, "and whether the King having taken it, no one "perſon be bound by it? *p.* 143. *Anſw.* Mr. *Baxter* leads me by this Queſtion to conſider, how His Majeſty was dealt with by the *Scots* in this matter; how they tortured him with various temptations of hopes and fears, and ſo affronted him with many horrible Reproaches of his own Sins, as well as of the Sins of His Father and Grandfather, that he often attempted to leave them; what Provocations he met with in private, may be gueſſed at by their publick Actions. The *Thurſday* before the Coronation was ſet apart as a Solemn day of Humiliation throughout the Land, for the Sins of the Royal Family. *Robert Douglas* in the Coronation Sermon, told the King, "That His Grandfather King *James* remembred "not the kindneſs of them, who had held the "Crown upon his Head; yea, he perſecuted faith-"full Miniſters; he never reſted till he had un-"done Presbyterial Government, and Kirk Aſſem-"blies, ſetting up Biſhops, and bringing in Cere-"monies. In a word, "he laid the foundation "whereupon his Son, our late King did build "much miſchief in Religion all the days of his "Life. 73.

P. 52. He tells the King to his Face, "That a "King abuſing his Power, to the overthrow of "Religion, Laws, and Liberties (which are the "fundamentals of that *Covenant*) may be control-"led and oppoſed. And if he ſet himſelf to o-"verthrow all theſe by Arms, they who have "power, as the Eſtates of the Land, may and "ought (I ſuppoſe by obligation of the Cove-"nant) to reſiſt by Arms; becauſe he doth by "that oppoſition break the very Bonds, and o-"verthrow the Eſſentials of this Contract and "Covenant. This may ſerve (ſays he) to juſti-"fy the proceedings of this Kingdom, againſt "the late King, who in a Hoſtile way ſet himſelf "to overthrow Religion, Parliaments, Laws and "Liberties. Thus was the Kings Crown lined with Thorns, and he had Gall and Vinegar given him to drink, inſtead of the Royal Unction which that prophane *Scot* thus derides; "*p.* 34. The "Biſhops behoved to perform this Rite, and the "King behoved to be Sworn to them. But now, "by the Bleſſing of God, Popery and Prelacy are "removed, let the anointing of Kings with Oyl, "go to the door with them, and let them never "come in again. If the King ought by the Laws of the Kingdom to have been Sworn to the Biſhops, this may make void the Obligation of the Covenant; for the Coronation Oath is a right of the Subject, and concerns their intereſt and ſecurity, and the King as Heir to the Crown is obliged to that Oath, and if any ſubſequent Oath may violate that in one particular, it may alſo in others, and then farewel to *Magna Charta*, the priviledges of Parliament, and Liberty of the Subject. See

more in the *Review of the grand Case*, p. 139. 140. *P. 92.* He tells the King, "That God in his Righ-"teous judgments, suffereth Subjects to conspire "and rebel against their Princes, because they re-"bel against the *Covenant* made with God, (and "adds) I may say freely, that a chief cause of "the Judgment upon the Kings House, hath been "the Grandfathers breach of Covenant with God, "and the Fathers following steps in opposing "the work of God and his Kirk within these "Kingdoms; and probably too many do still think they may rebel again in Defence of the Covenant.

But I argue from the manner of the Kings taking the Covenant, (as it is related *p.* 75. *&c.*) that the King is not obliged by it to make any alteration in the Government of our Church, for thus it is related: That the National Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant being read, the King Swore, that for himself and successors, he should consent and agree *to all Acts of Parliament, injoyning the National Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant*, &c. in the Kingdom of *Scotland*, as they are approved by the general Assembly of that Kirk, and Parliament of that Kingdom. And that he should give his Royal Assent to *Acts and Ordinances of Parliament, passed or to be passed*, injoyning the same in his other Dominions. And in the *Declaration* set forth at *Edinborough* in His Majesties name, 1650. (But penned as it seems by the Covenanters,) He declares, "That if the "Houses of Parliament of *England*, sitting in free-"dom, shall think fit to present unto him the "propositions of peace agreed upon by both King-"doms,

" doms, he will not only accord to them, and " ſuch *Alterations* there *ament as the Houſes of Par-* " *liament, in regard of the Conſtitution of Affairs.* " *and the good of his Majeſty, and his Kingdoms ſhall* " *judge neceſſary*; but do what is further neceſſary " for the Proſecuting the ends of the Solemn " League and Covenant. Eſpecially in thoſe things " which concern the Reformation of the Church " of *England* in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and " Government. And *p.* 107. He doth alſo declare " his firm reſolution to manage the Government " of the Kingdom of *England*, by the Advice of " his Parliament, conſiſting of an Houſe of Lords, " and an Houſe of Commons there. All which His Majeſty hath punctually performed, and the Parliaments of both Kingdoms, having reſcinded the Covenant, and condemned it as an unlawful Oath, and ſettled the ancient Government of the Catholick Church: I ſpeak with all humble ſubmiſſion; His Majeſty is not at all obliged by that Covenant thus taken, much leſs to make any alteration in the Government of the Church of *England*; unleſs he would act not only contrary to the eſtabliſhed Laws, but contrary to that very Oath and Declaration by which the Non-conformiſts ſuppoſe him to be obliged; which oblige him to agree to ſuch *alterations*, as the Houſes of Parliament, in regard to the Conſtitution of Affairs, and the good of His Majeſty and his Kingdoms ſhould judge neceſſary, and to manage the Government of the Kingdom of *England*, by advice of his Two Houſes of Parliament. And this will anſwer the firſt Queſtion in the Negative, that neither the King (who was injuriouſly and

unlawfully, as is acknowledged) drawn to declare for it, and conſequently no other perſon that took it afterward, are bound by it to make any alteration, *&c.* If any alteration be found neceſſary, there are lawful means to be uſed for that end. But there is no obligation from this Covenant, being ſo repealed to uſe even lawful means, much leſs ſuch unlawful ones as the Covenant implies, (*i. e.*) for Subjects to reform without, and againſt the Magiſtrate and his Laws. By this alſo a ſecond queſtion is reſolved, *p.* 215. which Mr. *Baxter* calls the main queſtion: *Whether every Miniſter muſt or may become the Judge of all other Mens Conſciences and Oligations in three Kingdoms?* For let it be remembred that the caſe is only, whether they are obliged by the Covenant to endeavour any *alteration, &c.* Any lawful endeavours are not denyed, but the Covenant being Condemned as an unlawful thing, cannot lay an obligation on any to act againſt the Laws, whereby the Church Government is eſtabliſhed.

Againſt this, a third queſtion is urged, *whether this League and Covenant were a Vow to God, and not only a League and Covenant with Men, which* ceſſante occaſione, *and by conſent of Parliaments doth ceaſe.* Mr. *Baxter* affirms, that it was a Vow to God, and a League and Covenant of Men with one another that they will perform it; and inſtead of Proof he ſays it is notorious to any Man that readeth it with common underſtanding.

Anſw. 1. The Title of it is *a Solemn League and Covenant*; there is no mention of a Vow to God: And in the Preface, *a mutual League and Covenant.*

2. And in the Renunciation, it is to be declared,

red, that there lyes no Obligation from the *Oath*, commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant. If any part of it be a Vow to God, that is not mentioned to be disclaimed; for,

3. The particular Case wherein its Obligation is to be disclaimed, is to endeavour any alteration, *&c.* Now, how can it consist with the nature of a Vow to God, to make unnecessary alterations against the Laws of the Land? Would not this cause the Christian Religion in a short time to be exploded out of all Kingdoms?

4. It is notoriously known, that the few things that make the Contract, (as Mr. *Douglas* calls it) or Covenant between the Rebel *Scots* and *English*, to seem as a Vow to God, were used only as a pretence to draw on that part of the Covenant which is acknowledged to be unlawful, and which is the greatest part of the Covenant, the intent whereof was to strengthen the Rebellion against the King, as (by the negative Oath and the general actings of both Nations which followed) doth evidently appear: And what Rebellion or Heresie may not be Covenanted for, under pretence of such Vows? If therefore there had been any thing of a Vow to God in the Covenant, it was a horrid Profanation of Gods name, to make it subservient to such unlawful ends. And it is rightly observed, that it binds to the Extirpation of Bishops, out of other Churches, as well as out of ours alone.

5. The most part of those who took the Covenant when it was first imposed, had declared their approbation of the established Government, and sworn Obedience to the Bishops; so had ge-

netally all the Aſſembly, and fixed Miniſters, and as I preſume Mr. *Baxter* himſelf; and whatever contrary Oaths they took afterward, are rightly eſteemed to be as Null, the pretence of a Vow notwithſtanding.

6. It is inconſiſtent with the nature of a Vow to be forced, as the Covenant generally was, as hath been obſerved from Mr. *Baxter*, "That the "*Scots* taking advantage of the ſtraits to which "the King had reduced the *Engliſh* Parliament, "brought in the Covenant as the condition of "their help; and that the Houſe of Lords com-"plained of the Parliament (as Mr. *Baxter* calls "the Houſe of Commons) which tyed them to "meddle with nothing, but what they offered to "them. And though the Covenanters pretended for this Vow the Example of Gods people in other Nations, and the commendable practice of theſe Kingdoms in former times, yet there never was the like Oath for matter and manner, taken by any people, fearing God in any Age of the World.

I conclude with a Conceſſion of Mr. *Baxters*, *p.* 213. of the *Plea*: *It is not in the Subjects power by Vows to withdraw themſelves from Obedience to Authority*; which is proved from *Numb.* 30. And the Reaſon of it is, becauſe *Obligatio prior præjudicat poſteriori*, God hath firſt injoyned Obedience to our Superiours. They therefore lawfully requiring our ſubmiſſion to the eſtabliſhed Government, there can lye no obligation on me, or any other perſon to endeavour alteration of the Government. If any fault be found in ſubordinate Governours, we may in our places and callings en-

endeavour a Reformation of them, but the Government is a *noli me tangere*, we may not undermine foundations. But Mr. *Baxter* propoſeth another queſtion; *whether the Covenant as a Vow to God bind to things neceſſary?* Anſw. To all *neceſſary things* we are pre-ingaged by the Command of God, and extraordinary means muſt not be uſed when ordinary may ſerve. Mr. *Baxter* §. 43. of his *Directory*, ſays, *A Vow is as Null when the matter is morally or civilly out of our power, as if a Child or Servant Vow a thing which he cannot do lawfully without the conſent of his Parent or Maſter, though the thing in it ſelf be lawful; for God having bound me to obey my Superiours in all lawful things, I cannot oblige my ſelf by my own Vows.* §. 79. of his *Directory*. Make not a Law and Religion to your ſelves, which God never made by his Authority, nor bind your ſelves for futurity to all that is a duty at preſent, where it is poſſible the changes of things may change your duty. And §. 3. *p.* 19. *The true nature and uſe of Vows, is but for a more certain and effectual performance of our duties, not to make new Laws and Religions to our ſelves.* From which conceſſions it will follow, that the power of Reforming, *&c.* being in the King, the Vow was Null: And it is morally impoſſible for them to do that in their places and callings, which they cannot do without Invading the Place and Office of their Superiours. And therefore notwithſtanding the pretence of a Vow; yea though it were for things lawful (which the alteration of the eſtabliſhed Government is not) we may declare that there lyes no Obligation, *&c.*

P. 216. §. 13. Mr. *Baxter* inſiſts on the *Declara-*

tion, concerning *taking Arms againſt the King*, &c. Where he ſays, the queſtion is not of the firſt clauſe, of *taking Arms*, &c. For he grants that a *Popiſh King is to be obeyed in lawful things*, p. 77. but of the 2 *d.* viz. *I abhor that Traiterous poſition of taking Arms by his Authority againſt his perſon, or againſt thoſe that are commiſſioned by him.* This as the Law of the Land hath declared to be Traiterous, ſo hath the Law of God. 2 *Pet.* 2. 13. requiring ſubmiſſion to the King, as Supreme, and unto Governours ſent (or Commiſſioned) by him. The ground of this Declaration, was for the *ſecurity of the Kings Perſon*, againſt ſuch as diſtinguiſhing between his publick and private capacity, under pretence of his Authority detained his Towns, and fought thoſe Armies where the King was in perſon; but when they had Conquered him, they declared the Supreme Authority to be in themſelves. But Mr. *Baxter* pleads, *that Miniſters are moſtly ignorant of the Law, not knowing what is called a Commiſſion, and what Seal makes it ſuch, and they dare not think that a Lord Chancellour or Keeper, hath Power at his pleaſure to depoſe the King by Sealing Commiſſions to any to ſeize on his Forts*, &c. *Nor yet to deſtroy the Kingdoms, Cities, Laws and Judgments, and ſeize at pleaſure on all Mens Eſtates or Lives.* This had been good Doctrine if Mr. *Baxter* had taught it when the Kings broad Seal was broken, and by Virtue of a Counterfeit one, the Lives and Eſtates of the beſt Subjects were deſtroyed, the Act of Parliament hath declared the Supreme Authority to be inſeparable in the Kings Perſon, ſo that we cannot doubt of the Legality of Commiſſions granted

ed by him, and his pretended ignorance againſt the known Laws, being that Block on which the beſt of Kings fell; I hope no good *Engliſh*-Man will ſtumble at it again. But Mr. *Baxter* complains that theſe words [*againſt thoſe that are Commiſſioned by him*] are unexpounded, and have no limitations or exceptions. It is not fit for private men to diſtinguiſh where the Law doth not, or that an Uſurper, or Protector pretending Reformation and Liberty, and that abuſed Maxim of *Salus populi Suprema Lex*, ſhould rather be obeyed than ſuch as Act regularly by the Kings Commiſſion, and according to the known Laws. Wherefore to ſeek evaſions, and to ſuppoſe extraordinary Caſes, that may never happen againſt plain and neceſſary duties, ought not to be a Bar againſt this Declaration. That which followeth §. 14. "Of "deſerting their Flocks, and keeping Conven-"ticles; and §. 15. of not reſiding within Five "Miles of Cities and Corporations, are not con-"ditions of Conformity, but conſequences of their "Non-conformity. And I leave —— them to be read and conſidered by others, who will perceive how well Mr. *Baxter* deſerves the Character which the Reverend Biſhop *Sanderſon* gave of him: *That he never knew a Man of more pertinacious confidence, and leſs abilities in all his Converſation; A double minded Man is unſtable in all his Ways.*

An

An Answer to some passages in the Second Part of the Non-conformists Plea *for* Peace.

HAving reflected on as much of the First Part of the *Non-conformists Plea*, as concerned the Ministerial Conformity; I thought it not material to answer the many Impertinencies Printed in that Book: But finding a Second Part extant published as (the Authors say) to save their Lives, and the Kingdoms Peace, from the false and Bloody Plotters; who would first perswade the King and People that the Protestants, and particularly the *Non-conformists* are *Presbyterians* and *Fanaticks*; And next, that it was such *Presbyterians* that killed his Father; and next, that our Principles are Rebellious; and next, that we are Plotting Rebellion and his Death, *&c.* On which particulars he enlargeth in the Preface, where I find him thus to justify his party. I desire those that seek our Blood and Ruine by the false accusation of Rebellious Principles, to tell me if they can, what Body or Party of Men on Earth, have more sound and Loyal Principles of Government and Obedience: and *p.* 109. of that Book, We are far from designing any abasement of the Clergy, nor do we deny or draw others to deny any due reverence or obedience to them.

I conſidered that very many of Mr. *Baxters* Readers, are apt to believe him, and therefore muſt needs be greatly incenſed againſt thoſe whom he accuſeth to be the Perſecutors of ſuch a pious and peaceable party, *viz.* the Biſhops, whom he calls Thorns and Thiſtles, and the Military Inſtruments of the Devil, *p.* 122. of the Book of Concord, and *p.* 247. of the firſt part of the Plea, and complains, (as if he were in *Egyptian* Bondage, or the Popiſh Inquiſition) of tearing Engines, Goals, Starving, and Bloody Perſecution, Ruine and Death. Every good Man is ſenſible what Indignation, ſuch Cruelties practiſed upon innocent perſons, may raiſe in the hearts of our *Engliſh* Nation; who are noted for their compaſſion to their Brethren, in miſery againſt the Authors of it; and I ſuſpect theſe ſuggeſtions are publiſhed to inrage them, againſt their preſent Governours in Church and State, to prevent the miſchievous conſequences, whereof I have made the enſuing inquiries.

Popiſh *Clergy-Men.*

And Firſt, their reſpect to the Conforming Clergy, will appear in the Epiſtle, before the firſt part of the Plea inſcribed to the Conforming Clergy, where he thus reproacheth them to their Faces. It is now ſeventeen years ſince near 2000 Miniſters of Chriſt, were by Law forbidden the exerciſe of their Office, unleſs they did Conform to Subſcriptions, Covenants, Declarations and Practiſes which we durſt not do; becauſe we feared God. —— The reaſon of which Impoſitions, it is God and not we muſt have an account of, from the Convocation, *&c.* (by which, *&c.*) I ſuppoſe he

he means the Parliament that made thoſe Laws. He tells them of rendring odious them whom they never heard; and urging Rulers to execute the Laws againſt them. (*i. e.*) to Excommunicate ſilence, confine, impriſon, and undo them. He ſays, he is not ſo uncharitable, as to impute all their falſe reports to Malignity and Diabolism, but that it was ſtrangeneſs, (*i. e.* ignorance of) their caſe, which wrath and croſs intereſt kept them from hearing: He ſays he had read the Books of Biſhop *Morley*, Mr. *Stileman*, Mr. *Faukner*, Mr. *Fulwood*, Mr. *Durel*, Mr. *Fowlis*, Mr. *Nanſen*, Dr. *Boreman*, *Parker*, *Tomkins*, the *Friendly Debate*, Dr. *Aſhton*, Mr. *Hollingworth*, Dr. *Good*, Mr. *Hinckly*, *the Countermine*, Mr. *Leſtrange*, Mr. *Long*, &c. And I think (ſays he) Mr. *Tombes* hath ſaid more like truth for Anabaptiſtry, the late *Hungarian* for Polygamy; Many for drunkeneſs, ſtealing and lying in caſes of neceſſity, than ever he yet read for the lawfulneſs of all that is there deſcribed, (*viz.* the terms of conformity.) He tells them if they will not hear, thoſe will whom God will uſe to the healing of his Churches. He means ſuch Reformers as were in 42. and 43. to whom this Patriarch gives the Bleſſing of Peace-makers, and ſays, they ſhall be called the Children of God, as ſure as the Incendiaries in the late War, *viz. Brook*, *Pym*, *&c.* are by him called glorious Saints in Heaven, *p.* 83. of his Saints reſt. And thus reminding them of his paſtoral Admonition; if any of you be an hinderer or ſlanderer of Gods word, *&c.* he hath ſufficiently evidenced what reverence he hath for the Conforming Clergy.

But how he hath diſcharged that which he profeſſeth

feſſeth to be his duty, *p.* 246. of his Plea, *part.* 1. Moſt of our acquaintance take it for their duty to do their beſt to keep up the Reputation of the publick conformable Miniſtry: Let the Reader judge by bis deeds, rather than his words, ſeeing he continueth Conventicles himſelf, and defends others in the ſame Practiſe. And for his Admonition to us, I ſhall commend to him one Leſſon from our Catechiſm; to keep his Tongue from evil ſpeaking, lying and ſlandering.

By their fruits ye ſhall know them.

The Second thing I obſerve in his Plea for the innocency of his party, is, That no Men on Earth have more ſound and Loyal Principles of Government and Obedience. *Anſw.* While they were Governours none exacted Obedience more ſeverely, or Ruled more imperiouſly; but take them in the capacity of Subjects, and their practices ſhew what their principles are. But let us hear his Plea to the Accuſations: The firſt is, that they are Presbyterians and Fanaticks. 2. That they began the War in 42. and 43. 3. That they deſtroyed the King. 4. That their principles are diſloyal. 5. That they are Plotting a Rebellion. To the firſt, he tells us what a Presbyterian is, *viz.* ſuch as hold Church Government, not only without Biſhops, but alſo by Presbyteries, conſiſting of two ſorts of Elders, Preaching and Ruling, and over theſe Claſſes, and over theſe a National Aſſembly, conſiſting of the ſame two ſorts. That ſuch a Government was intended by the Long Parliament, appears by their Ordinances, *Anno* 1643. for impoſing the Covenant, rooting out Epiſcopacy, bringing all to an Uniformity (with the

the Church of *Scotland*) and *January* 44. For taking away the Book of Common-Prayer, and eſtabliſhing the Directory. And *June* 5. 46. for ſetling without farther delay of Presbyterial Government in the Church of *England*. And *Auguſt* 28. for Ordination of Miniſters by Claſſical Presbyteries, within their reſpective bounds; which Form of Government to be uſed in the Church of *England* and *Ireland*, was agreed by the Lords and Commons in Parliament, after advice had with the Aſſembly of Divines: This Aſſembly was called by the Parliament, 12 *June* 43. conſiſting of Lords, Knights, Eſquires, and ſome Divines, who aſſented to the Ordinances above mentioned, and therefore it will be very hard for Mr. *Baxter* to perſwade us that they were Conformiſts (of which more hereafter) I ſhall account them Presbyterians. And if ever a Child was like his Father, our preſent Non-conformiſt is like the Presbyterian in 43.

The Aſſembly drew up an Exhortation for the taking of the Covenant; where they declare that the Government by Biſhops is evil, juſtly offenſive and burdenſome to the Kingdom.

Sic oculos, ſic ille manus, ſic ora gerebat.

And what if as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, they do not now exerciſe their beloved Diſcipline; are thoſe Lions no Lions which the King keeps within the Tower? Have they not the ſame appetite to the Church and Crown Lands, the ſame antipathy to Prelacy, the ſame zeal for the Covenant and Directory? Were they not generally Ordained by theſe Presbyterians, *non tantum abſente ſed ſpreto Epiſcopo*,

as

as Mr. *Baxter* ſays? theſe then I conclude to be Presbyterians, and if Mr. *Baxter* will add the term Fanaticks, I cannot help it; they who plead *aliquid ἔνωθεν*, ſome impulſes on their ſpirits, moving them from ingulphing with this generation, by reaſon whereof they cannot go back from that more ſpiritual, plain and ſimple zealous Service of Almighty God, in the way they are in, and reformation they ſeek, againſt the (eſtabliſhed) Worſhip and Diſcipline. (See *p.* 9. of the Anſwer to Doctor *Stillingfleets* Sermon) I ſay they, who for want of reaſons to defend their cauſe, do plead impreſſions on their ſpirits, do prove themſelves to be Fanatick, and I have proved them to be Presbyterians.

The Second Accuſation is, that we began the War in 41. and 42. To this he pleads. 1. The King hath ſaid ſo much for the Act of Oblivion, that it is no ſign of Loyalty and Peace to violate it. *Anſw.* An Act of Pardon implies guilt, though it exempt from puniſhment. And Secondly, God himſelf will pardon none but the penitent, whatever the King may do. 2. You plead that falſe reporters ſay, that the Papiſts were the Kings party, and the Presbyterians the Parliaments, in the beginning of the *Engliſh* War. *Anſw.* They are falſe reporters indeed, that ſay the Papiſts were the Kings Party, which were not an hundred part of his party; and I wonder not that Mr. *Baxter* calls it a falſe report, becauſe it ſhews the Papiſts to have been more Loyal Subjects than the Presbyterians. Yet wanted not a number of Papiſts, ſome openly, and others under hoods, to Act for the Parliament, and they wanted not invitation

vitation and temptations to have been all of that ſide, as the Royal Martyr declared.

2. Mr. *Baxter* ſays, the contrary is ſo well known to Men yet living, that the reporters can hope to ſeduce none but young men and ſtrangers. Doth Mr. *Baxter* mean by the contrary, That the Papiſts were not the Kings party, and the Presbyterians were not the Parliaments party, or that the Papiſts were the Parliaments party, and the Presbyterians were the Kings party at the beginning of our War; this I take to be contrary, and I think no Man living can affirm it. But he tells us that the controverſie was begun between Arch-biſhop *Abbot*, and his adherents, and Biſhop *Laud*, and thoſe that adhered to him. *Anſw.* There was no War begun in Arch-biſhop *Abbots* time, nor long after; but the controverſie which made way for the War was of another kind, and a more ancient date, as Mr. *Baxter* relates it, §. 7. of his Plea, *part* 1. To which I ſuppoſe he refers the Reader; and there he ſays, the root of the difference between the old Non-conformiſts and the Conformiſts was this, That one ſort thought they ſhould ſtick to the meer Scripture rule and ſimplicity, and go far from all Additions which were found invented or abuſed by Papiſts. The other ſide thought they ſhould ſhew more reverence to the Cuſtoms of the Ancient Church, and retain that which was not forbidden in Scripture, which was introduced before the ripeneſs of Popery, or before the year 600. at leaſt, and which was found lawful in the *Roman* Church, and common to them with the Greek. And herein I have reaſon to believe Mr. *Baxter* was of the ſame mind with

the

the Conformiſts againſt the Non-conformiſts. See *Directory, part* 3. *ch.* 2. This difference was begun among the Exiles at *Franckfort* (ſays Mr. *Baxter*,) ſome ſtriving for the *Engliſh* Liturgy, and others for a freer way of praying, (*i. e.*) from the preſent ſenſe and habit of the Speaker, (which by Mr. *Baxters* favour was not any where publickly practiſed at that time, no not by *Calvin* himſelf at *Geneva.*) But farther, Queen *Elizabeth*, and King *James* (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*,) diſcountenancing and ſuppreſſing Non-conformiſts. They attempted in *Northamptonſhire* and *Warwickſhire*, to ſet and keep up private Churches, and governed them in a Presbyterian way, but the attempt was broken by the induſtry of Arch-biſhop *Whitgift* and *Bancroft:* Some Conformed, and ſome were Connived at, which kept them from gathering ſecret Churches; yet ſome Preached ſecretly in Houſes, and ſome publickly for a day and away; ſome were further Alienated from the *Engliſh* Prelacy, and ſeparated from their Churches, and ſome of them called Browniſts were ſo hot at home, that they were put to death. Mr. *Ainſworth*, *Johnſon*, *Robinſon*, and others fled beyond Sea, and there gathered Churches, and broke by diviſions among themſelves, as their Succeſſors did in our memory. It will not be impertinent to ſhew from Mr. *Cambden*, how troubleſome this ſort of Men were under Queen *Elizabeth*, p. 420. of the *Engliſh* Tranſlation of *Cambden*, They choſe that ſeaſon when the *Spaniards* amuſed the whole Nation from abroad, by their Invincible *Armado*, as they called it to diſturb her at home. " And ne-
" ver did contumacious impudency againſt Eccleſi-

" aſtical Magiſtrates, ſhew it ſelf more bold and
" inſolent; for when the Queen would not give
" Ear to Innovators in Religion, who deſigned
" to cut in ſunder the very ſinews of Eccleſiaſtical
" Government, and her Royal Prerogative at once;
" ſome of thoſe Men who were *great admirers of*
" *the Diſcipline of Geneva*, thought there was no
" better way to be taken for eſtabliſhing it in
" *England*, than by inveighing and railing againſt
" the *Engliſh* Hierarchy, and ſtirring up the people
" to a diſlike of Biſhops. They therefore ſet forth
" ſcandalous Books againſt the Government of the
" Church and Prelates, as *Martin Mar Prelate*,
" *Minerals*, *Diotrephes*, *A Demonſtration of Diſ-*
" *cipline*, *&c.* in which Libels they belched forth
" moſt virulent Calumnies, and opprobrious taunts
" and reproaches, in ſuch a manner that the Au-
" thors ſeemed rather ſcullions out of the Kitchen,
" than pious and godly Men; yet the Authors
" were *Penry* and *Udal*, Miniſters of the word,
" and *George Throckmorton* a Learned Man: their
" favourers were *Richard Knightly* and *Wigſton*
" Knights. Others exerciſed their Diſcipline in
" corners in deſpight of Authority, and the Laws,
" holding Claſſes in ſeveral places, and forming
" Presbyteries; for which *Thomas Cartwright*, *Ed-*
" *mund Snape*, *Andrew King*, *Proudlow*, *Payne*, and
" other Miniſters were called in queſtion, whom
" ſome of the zealots conſpired to deliver out of
" the Magiſtrates hands, *p.* 451. He tells us how
" one *Hacket* inſinuated himſelf into certain Di-
" vines, which with a burning zeal laboured to
" bring the Presbyterial Diſcipline of *Geneva* into
" *England*; among whom was one *Wiggington* a

" ſilly

" ſilly Brain-ſick Miniſter, a deſpiſer and enemy
" of the Magiſtrates; by *Wiggintons* means, he
" was acquainted with *Coppinger* a Gentleman,
" who perſwaded *Arthington* an admiret of that
" Diſcipline: Firſt that himſelf, and then that
" *Arthington* was extraordinarily called of God for
" the good of the Church, and that way was re-
" vealed from Heaven to draw the Queen and
" Council to a better mind, meaning to admit of
" the Diſcipline of *Geneva*; *Coppinger* imparted this
" to *Hacket*, who by his counterfeit holineſs, and
" fervent praying *ex tempore*, his faſting on the
" Lords days, and boaſting that he had been buf-
" feted by *Satan*, and had Revelations from God.
" —— He Propheſied that there ſhould be no
" more Popes, and that *England* ſhould be lamen-
" tably afflicted that year, with Peſtilence and
" Famine, except the Diſcipline of the Lord, and
" Reformation were admitted in the Realm.
" They conſpired as was proved by their Letters
" to accuſe the Arch-biſhop of *Canterbury*, and the
" Lord Chancellour of Treaſon, (and one of the
" party ſtabbed one *Hawkins*, a famous Sea-Cap-
" tain, ſuppoſing him to be the Lord Chancellor)
" *Hacket* had ſuch an implacable malice to the
" Queen, that he ſaid often ſhe had forfeited her
" right to the Crown; he defaced her Arms
" and Picture, ſtriking his Dagger through the
" Breaſt of it (to omit many things) *Hacket* be-
" ing Indicted for Treaſon Confeſſed it, and was
" Executed; dying, he lift up his Eyes to Hea-
" ven, and grinning ſaid, Doſt thou thus repay me?
" inſtead of a Kingdom, I come to revenge it.
" *Coppinger* ſhortly after ſtarved himſelf in Priſon,

" *Arthington* repented ſeriouſly, and ſet forth a " Book of it. Yet many others oppoſed the Diſ- " cipline of the Church, reproaching the Prelates, " and drawing ſome common Lawyers to their " party, but the Queen knowing that her autho- " rity was ſtruck at through the Biſhops ſides, " broke the force of the adverſaries without noiſe, " and maintained the Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, " inviolate againſt all Oppoſers, (Presbyterians " and Fanaticks.) Nor were theſe Men leſs trouble- ſome under King *James*, having conceived great hopes from his Education in *Scotland*, but he knew them ſo well, that he never ſhewed them any favour: In his firſt year they frame a Petition in the names of a Thouſand Miniſters for Reforma- tion, which I find anſwered by the Univerſity of *Oxford*, and ſeconded by the Univerſity of *Cam- bridge*.

The King told his Parliament, *March* 19. 1603. The third which I call a Sect rather than Religi- on, is the Puritan and Noveliſt, who do not differ ſo far from us in points of Religion, as in their confuſed forms of Polity and Parity, being ever diſcontented with the preſent Government, and impatient to ſuffer any ſuperiority, which makes their Sect unable to be ſuffered in any well go- verned Common-wealth. And it is one reaſon why *Grotius* was ſo condemned for a Papiſt a- mong this people; becauſe in his Book de *Anti- Chriſto*, he hath left this Character of them, *Cir- cumferamus oculos per omnem hiſtoriam, quod unquam ſeculum vidit tot ſubditorum in principes bella ſub religionis titulo? & horum concitatores ubique reperi- untur Miniſtri Evangelici (ut quidam ſe vocant) quod*

quod genus hominum in quæ pericula etiam nunc optimos Civitatis Amſtelodamenſis magiſtratus conjicerit? videat ſi cui libet de Presbyterorum in Reges audacia librum Jacobi Britanniarum Regis, cui nomen Donum Regium *videbit eum, ut erat magni judicii ea prædixiſſe, quæ nunc cum dolore & horrore conſpicimus.* I will give it you preſently in that Kings Engliſh.

But the King giving them a fair hearing in the conference at *Hampton* Court, partly by his Arguments, and partly by his Authority ſuppreſſed them for that time: Yet this reſtleſs people, ſo incenſed him by their murmurings and reproaches, that he frequently in his Writings and Speeches in Parliament, profeſſed both his jealouſie of them, and caution againſt them in his Preface to the Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον. Theſe raſh heady Preachers, ſays he, think it their honour to contend with Kings, and perturb whole Kingdoms; and *p.* 41. 42. Take heed my Son to ſuch Puritans, very Peſts in the Church and Common-weal, whom no Deſert can oblige, neither Oaths nor Promiſes bind, breathing nothing but Sedition and Calumnies, aſpiring without meaſure, railing without reaſon, and making their own Imaginations without any warrant of the word, the ſquare of their Conſciences. I proteſt before the great God, and ſince I am here as upon my Teſtament, it is no place for me to lye in; that ye ſhall never find with any *Highland* or border Thieves greater ingratitude and more lies, and vile perjuries than with theſe Fanatick-ſpirits; and ſuffer not the principles of them to brook your Land, if ye like to ſit at reſt, except ye would keep them for try-

ing your patience, as *Socrates* did an evil Wife. The good King *Charles* found this Prophecy to be true; for notwithſtanding all the care that himſelf, and Arch-biſhop *Laud* (who apprehended the approaching danger) to ſuppreſs them, in ſo much as that Mr. *Baxter* ſays, in that 7. §. That the old Non-conformiſts being moſt dead, and the latter gone moſt to *America*; we cannot learn that in 1640. there were many more Non-conformiſts Miniſters in *England* than there be Counties, if ſo many; the Wolves be like had got on the Sheeps Cloathing, and not being able to ruine the Church by open force, ſeek to undermine it by ſecret Arts, being got within the Pale. In 37. ſays Mr. *Baxter*, Arch-biſhop *Laud* uſing more ſeverity than formerly, and the Viſitations inquiring more after private Faſts and Meetings, and going out of their Pariſhes to hear. —— And in many Places Lectures, and Afternoon Sermons being put down (which was done only where Faction and Sedition were Sown, and there Catechizing a much more uſeful exerciſe, was injoyned in its room) by theſe things (and ſome other which he there mentioneth) the minds of Men were made more jealous than before, (and fears and jealouſies were made the grounds of the War, the King and Arch-biſhop being reported to be Popiſhly affected, though they both, as well in their Life-time, as at their Deaths, gave irrefragable Arguments for the contrary, ſealing the truth of their Profeſſions with their Blood.) And after the Impriſonment of ſome, the ſtigmatizing of others, and the removal of many beyond the Seas, all which, both many, and ſome, amounted not

not to above Three or Four; whom though the Parliament received in Triumph, and plentifully rewarded, yet they found them to be turbulent Persons, *viz.* *Prin*, *Burton* and *Bastwick*, for I hear not of any removed beyond the Seas by authority) these were the causes of Alienating the peoples Minds from the Bishops, and made them afraid of Popery more than before, (and so it is still, any restraint from Faction is Condemned for Popery) Mr. *Baxter* tells us there of another Intregue; Then was the New Liturgy imposed on the *Scots*, with other changes there attempted (which were the resuming of some Lands belonging to the Church and Crown, which had been Sacrilegiously withheld, during a great part of King *James* and King *Charles*'s Reign; with the fear of losing the Tithes that some great Men there detained from the Clergy) whereupon the *Scots* Armed and Invaded *England*, and some *English* Lords (saith Mr. *Baxter*) took advantage to prevail with the King to call a Parliament once again. And here doubtless was the beginning of the War, the *Scots* and such *English* as were in confederacy, and had agreed upon a Covenant for Reformation, being the first Aggressors. But let Mr. *Baxter* proceed —— The *Irish* (observing it is like how the *Scots* thrived in their Rebellion) on *Oct.* 23. 1641. rose and murdered 200000. Persons, and (Mr. *Baxter* is not ashamed to say) the News was here reported, that they said they had the Kings Commission (just as much as the Parliament had to fight by his Authority against his Person,) whereupon the Parliaments Declarations, raised in multitudes of the people, a fear

that they had partakers in *England*, and when they had done their work there they would come hither. And (mark the conſequence) there was no way of ſafety, but to adhere to the Parliament for their own defence, (*i. e.* to ſtrengthen the War againſt the King.) And in 42. ſays he the lamentable Civil War broke out; but between whom? did the Biſhops fight againſt the King? or againſt one another? or againſt the Parliament? no ſuch matter. How began the War then? Mr. *Baxter* ſays, the Houſes of Lords and Commons conſiſted of ſuch as had been Conformiſts, except an inconſiderable number. Some number then were apparently Non-conformiſts, and it ſeems they had infected many others; for Mr. *Baxter* ſays, they were ſuch as *had been* Conformiſts; they were not ſo when the War began: and (*N.B.*) their fear of being over-powr'd by the Loyal party, of whom they thought themſelves in ſudden danger, cauſed them to countenance ſuch Petitionings and Clamours of the *Londoners* Apprentices, and others, as we think, diſorders and Provocations of the King. This doubtleſs was a beginning of the War; of which, ſee the Kings complaint in his *Ch.* of Tumults: Mr. *Baxter* ſays farther, the firſt open beginning was about the Militia, which by an Act of Parliament is thus determined: That the ſole Command and diſpoſition thereof is, and by the Laws of *England*, ever was the undoubted right of His Majeſty, and that both, or either of the Houſes of Parliament cannot, nor ought to pretend to the ſame, *&c.* How then did the controverſie between the Biſhops and Conformiſts begin the War, when the diſpute of the Militia

Militia did it. In truth there were (as *Wilſon* in his Hiſtory of King *James* confeſſeth) Regians and Republicans, and the diſpute in ſeveral Parliaments was between the Prerogative and Priviledges, and as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, where other Parliaments ended, that of 40. began. And is it not ſtrange, that there ſhould be ſo few Non-conformiſts in 41. and 42. and yet in 43. when the Covenant was brought in, all the Parliament and Aſſembly, and Officers in any Court, in the Army, and in the Navy, ſhould generally take the Covenant? for that was made the Teſt of all ſuch as ſhould be intruſted: and we hear of very few that refuſed, and I think there is no great difference between a Covenanter and a Presbyterian, who ſtill cry up the *Scottiſh* Diſcipline, as the very Scepter and Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, to which all Kings and Scepters muſt bow or break.

The Third Accuſation is, the death of the King, of which Mr. *Baxter* ſays, that he proved in times of Uſurpation, that the Presbyterians deteſted it, and that it was done by a Proud Conquering Army. *Anſw.* Who roſe that Army, and carried on that War wherein the King periſhed? it was not the laſt ſtroak given by the Independents, that felled that Royal Oak; there were many repeated blows at the very Root of Majeſtie given by others, which cut all the Ligaments of his Power and Authority in ſunder, chopt off all the Branches, his two great Miniſters (as Mr. *Baxter* calls them) the whole Order of Biſhops, His power of the Militia, Forts, Garriſons and Navy, and expoſed the declining trunk to the fury of a Raſcal party,

party, whom themſelves had Armed to the Kings ruine. I ſhall freely give you my thoughts of it, in an anſwer to another writing of Mr. *Baxters*, where he ſeeks more at large to excuſe the Presbyterians from this horrid Crime. Mr. *Baxter* ſays, were it not for entring upon an unpleaſing and unprofitable task : I would ask you, who that Juncto of Presbyterians was that dethron'd the King. *Anſw.* The queſtion I confeſs is very unpleaſing; for,

Infandum renovare jubes Baxtere *dolorem.*

Yet becauſe it may be profitable to know the truth; I ſay, that the dethroning ſo good a King, was a fact of an unparalled nature, to which the Sins of the whole Nation contributed, as well as yours and mine, and whereof we ought ſtill to repent and beg pardon notwithſtanding the Act of Oblivion. Yet there was a Select Juncto, that had a more immediate influence into it, and you ask me who they were; though I believe you know them better than my ſelf, I will tell you my thoughts freely.

Firſt, they were the Men whom Mr. *Baxter* Canonizeth for Saints, in his *Everlaſting Reſt*, p. 83. in my Edition, *viz. Brook*, and *Prin*, and *Hambden*, and *White*, &c. For I ſuppoſe you could have named many more of your own Coat, as precious Saints as they, of whom you ſay with an Aſſeveration, Surely they are now Members of a more knowing, unerring, well-ordered, right-aiming, ſelf-denying, unanimous, honourable, Triumphant Senate than this from whence they were taken, or

ever

ever Parliament will be: But what if they are gone to another place, than what your *Everlasting Rest* intended? have you not made a scurvy Reflection on your long beloved Parliament, and some Men do fear they were never admitted into Gods everlasting rest; because you that fancied them there, were ashamed to continue them in yours, being left out in your latter Editions.

Secondly, I say it was that Juncto, who procured great numbers of factious and tumultuous people, in a rude and illegal way to affright the Loyal and most considerable part of the Parliament from their duties, and trust reposed in them by God and Man; such were the Kings Majesty, and the Prince, the Loyal Nobles, the Bishops and chosen Gentry, posting them up as Malignants, and exposing them to the fury of the Rabble; of which tumults one of your Saints, Mr. *Pym* by name, said God forbid, that the House of Commons should dishearten their people, to obtain their just desires in such a way: *Exact. Collect.* p. 531. Mr. *Baxter* p. 474. of the *Holy Common-wealth* makes this Objection, The tumults at *Westminster* drove him away; to which he answereth: Only by displeasing him, not by indangering or meddling with him; and another eminent Man of Mr. *Baxters* acquaintance in his *Jehovah Jireth*, p. 65. says, the Apprentices and Porters were stimulated and stirred up by Gods Providence Thousands of them to Petition the Parliament for speedy redress. Whereas the Five Members and their favourers had inraged the multitude

tude not ſo much to Petition the Parliament, as to affront the King.

Thirdly, It was that Juncto, who againſt His Majeſties Crown and Dignity, againſt the known Laws, and his expreſs Proclamation to the contrary, did contrive and impoſe, under heavy penalties the Solemn League and Covenant upon the Nation, whereby they did juſtify the Rebellion, and avow the maintenance of it, againſt the King and his Forces. And having firſt vowed with their Lives and Eſtates, to preſerve the Rights and Priviledges of Parliament; they add —and to preſerve the Kings Majeſties Perſon, and Authority, in the preſervation and defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdom; Which experience ſheweth, they no more intended, though it be here put in, as it was in *Eſſex*'s Commiſſion, than it was in *Fairfax*'s, where (as I am informed) they left it out, and if they meant as they ſpeak, they had no great care of his perſon, having *actually deprived him of his Authority.* And beſides that limitation, they preſerve the Kings Perſon in defence of the true Religion, Covenanted to introduce another Religion in Doctrin and Worſhip, in oppoſition to that which was eſtabliſhed by Law, and reſolutely defended by his Majeſty, and to root out Epiſcopacy, which as he had ſworn to ſupport, ſo had it been a great prop to the Throne; and therefore his Majeſty declared concerning the *19.* Propoſitions, that he could not conſent unto them without violating his Conſcience, and a total extirpation of that Government, whoſe Rights they had a mind to invade; and which was neceſſary to the well being

being of His Majeſty, as by many Arguments in the Chapter concerning Church Government it appears. This certainly was one of the keeneſt Inſtruments that hewed down the Throne. For the Speech without Doors (defending Mr. *Challoners* Speech within Doors) tells the Parliament, that they are bound by their Covenant (for bringing evil Inſtruments to Condigne Puniſhment) to deſtroy the King and his Poſterity, and that they cannot juſtifie the taking away of *Straffords* and *Canterbury*'s Lives for Delinquency, while they ſuffered the chief Delinquent to go unpuniſhed, *Oxford* Reaſons, *p.* 22. And the Speeches within Doors ſpake no leſs, for Sir *H. Martyn* told them, the Kings Office was forfeitable, and that the happineſs of the Kingdom depended not on him, or any of the Royal Branches of that Stock, *Exact. Collect.* p. 552. and Sir *H. Ludlow*, that he was not worthy to be King of *England*. That this was the ſenſe which their own Creatures had of the Covenant, appears by the Anſwer of the Army to the *Scots* Declaration 1648. Who pleading that they had Covenanted for preſervation of the King, reply in a Paper Printed for *Robert White* before the Kings death; That it was conceived, to be abſurd and hypocritical, to ſwear the Preſervation of the Kings Perſon as a Man, and at the ſame time to be ingaged in a War againſt him, and he in the Field. And Mr. *Marſhal* had ſaid long before, That if the King had been ſo ſlain, it had been none of the Parliaments fault; for he might have kept himſelf farther off if he pleaſed, *p.* 19. of his Letter. The ſame Man ſaid in his Sermon, *Jan.* 8. 1647.

The

The queſtion is now, whether Chriſt or Anti-Chriſt ſhall be King. And in a Sermon to the Mayor and Aldermen 1644. Theſe are miſerable and accurſed men, Factors for Hell, Satans Bouteſeus, and as true zealots are ſet on fire from Heaven; ſo theſe Mens Fire is kindled from Hell, whither alſo it carrieth them. Mr. *Arrowſmith* in a Sermon 1643. It is not a Kingdom divided againſt it ſelf, but one Kingdom againſt another; the Kingdom of Chriſt againſt Anti-Chriſt: So my Countryman *John Bond* told them they fought againſt *Babylon*, *Dagon* and Anti-Chriſt, and exhorted them to pull it down; though like *Samſon* they dyed with it. In a Sermon 1644. *Joſeph Boden* ſaid, they were fighting for the Lamb againſt the Beaſt, *Anno* 1644. And Mr. *Marſhal* in his (*Meroz*) I pray look on me as one that comes to beat a Drum in your Ears, to ſee who will come out to follow the Lamb. This uſe the Covenanters made of that limitation, defending the Kings Perſon in the preſervation of Religion; and you know who ſays, *p.* 423. of the Holy Common-wealth, We are to believe that Men would kill them, whom they fight againſt. And doubtleſs if His Majeſty had periſhed in the War, the guilt had lain not only on the Souldiers, but chiefly on thoſe that gave them their Commiſſion; The Author of Bounds and Bonds ſpake home at that time, If by the Covenant you thought your ſelves indiſpenſably bound to preſerve the Royal Perſon, how comes it to paſs, that you thought your ſelves obliged by the ſame Covenant, to wage War againſt him.

I have heard of a diſtinction (ſaith he) between his

his Power and his Perſon, but never between his Perſon and himſelf. And if the Covenant would have diſpenſed with any Souldier of *England* or *Scotland*, to kill his Perſon by accident of War, (as his Life was oft in danger before he came to the Scaffold) his death had been violent, and the Obligation to preſerve him had ended; and yet according to this argument, the Covenant had not been broken; why then ſhould thoſe Men think the World ſo dull, as not to underſtand plainly enough, that the Covenant provided for his death more ways than one.

4. They that permitted ſuch Pamphlets to be publiſhed without controle, as declared the King to be a Tyrant, *Oxford* Reaſons, *p.* 21. That judged his Actions to be illegal, and his Declarations falſe and ſcandalous, and his ſuggeſtions as falſe as the Father of lies could invent, *Exact Collect.* p. 494. That baniſhed the Queen as a Traitor, Impriſoned the Biſhops in the Tower; That held him to ſuch unreaſonable Articles and Propoſitions, at *Newcaſtle*, and *Carisbrook*, as His Majeſty declared he could not conſent unto, without deveſting him of his Authority; That rejected all his offers for peace; And in *January* 17. 1647. Voted no more Addreſſes, and that they could repoſe no more truſt and confidence in him (which was a year before they were ſecluded the Houſe) which by the Army was underſtood of their intention to proceed in Juſtice againſt him. They who deprived him of all the Comforts of his Life, his Wife and Children, his Counſellours and Chaplains, as if with an *Italian* hatred they would have deſtroyed his Soul as well as his Body. Theſe

were

were they, that did *diminuere Caput Regis*, as the Civil Law ſpeaks, and they who afterward, finding him thus bound and fettered, defamed and condemned, did *obtruncare Caput Regis*, were but the others Executioners. What action was more barbarous than that of the *Scots*, ſelling their Native Prince, that caſt himſelf upon them, to his declared and avowed Enemies? after which he was hurried up and down, from one Priſon to another, and inhumanly treated, till he was forcibly taken from them. Whoever ſhall compare the Declaration of the *Scots*, when they Invaded *England*, upon their Covenant, with the actings of the High Court of Juſtice againſt His Majeſty, may ſee, what Coppy they wrote after, and whoſe Journy-men they were, in bringing him to the Block, whom they had pulled out of the Throne.

They were *Roman* Souldiers that actually Crucified our Saviour; but we know who Sold him, and how long the Chief Prieſts and Elders took Counſel againſt him, *Matth.* 27. 2. And St. *Peter* tells the Men of *Iſrael*, *Acts* 2. 23. Him have ye taken, and with wicked hands Crucified, though the *Roman* Souldiers did it. There is this only difference between the Graves and the Priſons of Kings, that in the Priſons they dye daily, or are buried alive, in the Grave they are at reſt from all their fears and ſorrows.

But to this it may be replied, that theſe were not Presbyters, properly ſo called, though they were a Juncto of Presbyterians: I would therefore have it conſidered, whoſe Scholars theſe were, who taught and animated them to theſe practices, and upon whoſe principles they acted;

I could ſet down ſuch maximes of the Conſiſtorian Brethren, as the Jeſuites would bluſh to own; but I ſhall forbear to foul my Paper with ſuch Collections, as I have among my *Adverſaria*: The Reader may ſatisfie himſelf, *uſque ad nauſeam*, if he obſerve what is Authentickly mentioned in His Majeſties large Declaration, in Biſhop *Bancrofts* dangerous poſitions, in Biſhop *Spotſwood*, and the Writings of the ſeveral Presbyteries of *Scotland*, in the reſult of falſe Principles, the *Calviniſts Cabinet*, and which is, *inſtar omnium*, the *Holy Commonwealth*. What fruit could ſuch bitter Roots produce, but Wormwood and Hemlock, as indeed they did in every Furrow of our Fields? It was ſaid of *Cato*, that he did good, not that he might appear to be good, but becauſe he could not do otherwiſe; and ſome Men do eſpouſe ſuch principles, that if they Act according to them, they cannot do any thing but what is notoriouſly evil. What ſhall we ſay of Mr. *Andrew Ramſey*, that Preached, That it was Gods will that the Primitive Chriſtians ſhould confirm the Truth by ſuffering; but now the Truth being eſtabliſhed, it is his will the Truth ſhould be defended by Action in reſiſting Tyrants? and *John Goodwin* ſaid as bad of the Doctrine of reſiſtance: Mr. *Robert Blaire* told his Auditors. —— Beloved, the Lord hath forſaken our King, and given him over to be led by the Biſhops, the blind brood of Anti-Chriſt, who are hot Beagles hunting for the Blood of the Saints: Nor can I forget Mr. *Douglas*'s Sermon at the Coronation, who turned the Pulpit into a Scaffold, and Acted the Martyrdom of the Father in the ſight of the Son. After theſe *Scottiſh* Pipes

did too many *Engliſh* Presbyters dance; whoſe Sermons were Satyrs, and invectives againſt the beſt of Kings, and his moſt Loyal Subjects. Take the active Covenanters from the greateſt to the leaſt; and as they thought it their duty, ſo they made it their buſineſs to do more than dethrone the King. I have ſaid enough of Mr. *Marſhal* already, let him that would know more read his Sermon on *Curſe ye Meroz*, and not his only, but the moſt of thoſe Sermons Preached to the Parliament, eſpecially on their Solemn days of Thankſgiving. Mr.*Caſe* in a Sermon to the Court-Marſhal, 1644. ſays, God would have no Mercy ſhewn, where the quarrel is againſt Religion, and the Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, *p.* 16. Theſe Men that would bring in Idolatry and falſe Worſhip to depoſe Chriſt from his Throne, and ſet up Anti-Chriſt in his place; ſuch a generation Chriſt hath doomed to deſtruction, *Luke* 19. 27. As for theſe mine enemies, bring them forth and ſlay them before me; and *p.* 18. What ſeverity will God expect from you, who are called to judge for God, between the Sons of *Belial*, bloody Rebels, and an whole Chriſtian Church and State, now reſiſting unto blood for Reformation? Let me ſay to you, as God ſaid to *Moſes* concerning the Midianites, vex thoſe Midianites and ſmite them, for they vex you with their Wiles, *Numb.* 25. 17,18. Mr. *Th. Palmer* ſaid, that God ſaw it good to bring Chriſt into his Kingdom by a Bloody way, *p.* 13. Dr. *Downing* of *Hackney*, in a Sermon to the *Artillery-men*; It is lawful for defence of Religion and Reformation of the Church, to take up Arms againſt the King: And Mr.*Calamy* ſeconds him,

him, it is commendable to fight for Peace; and Reformation againſt the Kings command.

Mr. *Love*, who was choſen as the fitteſt perſon to aſſiſt at the Treaty at *Uxbridge*, doth no doubt ſpeak the Senſe of the Juncto; he calls Epiſcopacy, and Liturgy, two Plague Soares, and tells the Commiſſioners, that while their enemies are going on in wicked practiſes, and they keep their principles; they may as ſoon make Fire and Water to agree, yea I had almoſt ſaid (quoth he) Heaven and Hell: And again it is the Sword, not diſputes that muſt end this controverſie. Wherefore turn your Plowſhares into Swords, and your Pruning-hooks into Spears, to fight the Lords Battles; to avenge the Blood of the Saints which hath been ſpilt, it muſt be avenged by us, or upon us: See *p.* 7. and 26. of *Englands* diſtemper. I have ſometime feared, always prayed that too much pitty and mercy in our State Phyſicians, may not retard the healing of the Land, *p.* 32. There are many malignant humours to be purged out of many of the Nobles, and Gentry in this Kingdom, before we can be healed. —— It was the Lord that troubled *Achan*, and cut him off; becauſe he troubled *Iſrael.* O that in this, our State Phyſicians would reſemble God to cut off thoſe from the Land, who have diſtempered it, (would you know whom he means, he ſpeaks plainly) *melius pereat unus quam unitas*, Men that lye under the guilt of much innocent Blood, are not fit perſons to be at peace with, till all the guilt of Blood be expiated, and avenged either by the Sword of the Law, or by the Law of the Sword; elſe the peace can never be ſafe or juſt.

Are theſe the principles of Love? or can they conſiſt with holineſs? it will amaze any Chriſtian to conſider, that though the hand of God might mind him of his ſin by the nature of his puniſhment: yet inſtead of declaring his Repentance a little before his death, he profeſſed his hatred to Malignants, his oppoſing the Tyranny of a King, ſaying, I did, it is true, in my place and calling oppoſe the forces of the late King, and were he alive again, and ſhould I live longer, (the cauſe being as then it was) I ſhould oppoſe him longer: In his Speech Sect. 14. Yet how horrid ſoever this final impenitence appears to be, too many that ſhould know, and do better things, have little ſenſe of it. And it is very remarkable, that *Prideaux* the Attorney General repeated moſt of theſe paſſages againſt Mr. *Love* at his Trial, as Arguments that he ought not to have any mercy ſhewed him. See the Printed Trial. What a ſad thing is it (ſaith Mr. *Caſe*) to ſee our King in the head of an Army of *Babylonians*, refuſing as it were to be called the King of *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland*, and chooſing rather to be called the King of *Babylon*, on *Iſa.* 43. 4. *p.* 18.

Thoſe that made their peace with the King at *Oxford*, were the Judas's of *England*, and it were juſt with God to give them their portion with *Judas*, ſaith Mr. *Calamy* in a Sermon Preached *Decemb.* 25. 1644. *p.* 18.

Mr. *Herle* in a Sermon to the Commons, *Novemb.* 5. 44. Do Juſtice to the greateſt, *Sauls* Sons are not ſpared; no, nor may *Agag* or *Benhadad*, though themſelves Kings. *Zimri* and *Cosbi*, the Princes

Princes of the people must be pursued into their Tents; This is the way to Consecrate your selves to God. *Strickland* at the same time to the same tune; You know the Story of Gods message to *Ahab*, for letting *Benhadad* go upon Composition. *Brooks* to the Commons, *Decemb.* 26. 1648. Set some of those grand Malefactors a mourning (that have caused the Kingdom to mourn so many years in Garments Rolled in Blood) by the Execution of Justice. But though many of those Sons of Thunder had done wickedly, there is one exceeds them all, as you may read partly in a submissive Petition of Mr. *Jenkins*, and in a Sermon Preached *Sept.* 24. 1656. Who thus discovers his inward parts to be very wickedness. Before the present Parliament; Worthy Patriots, you that are our Rulers in Parliament, it is often said, we live in times wherein we may be as good (he might more truly have said as bad) as we please, wherein we enjoy purity, and plenty, praised for this be that God, who hath delivered us from the impositions of Prelatical Innovations, Altar-genuflections, and cringes with Crosses, and all that Popish Trash and Trumpery; and truly I speak no more than what I have often thought, and said, the removal of these insupportable burdens, contravailes for the Blood, and treasure shed, and spent in these late distractions; nor did I as yet ever hear of any godly man that desired (were it possible) to purchase their friends or mony again at so dear a rate, as is the return of these, to have the Soul-burd'ning Anti-christian Yoaks reimposed on us. And if any such there be, I am sure their desire is no part of their godliness. From

this Mans principles one hath obſerved, That whoever are of this perſwaſion, do wiſh this King on the Scaffold too, provided that would free them from our Epiſcopacy, and think it lawful to Rebel again, and deſtroy as many Families more, to ſhake off that Yoak. Again Mr. *Jenkins* in his Conſcientious queſtions concerning ſubmiſſion to the then preſent power, 1651. Asks whether the ſtupendious Providences of God, manifeſted in the deſtruction of the late King, and his adherents in ſo many pitcht Battles, and in the Nations Univerſal forſaking of *Charles Stuart*, God hath not as plainly removed the Government from *Charles Stuart*, and beſtowed it on others, as ever he removed and beſtowed any Government by any Providence in any age? And whether a refuſal to yield obedience and Subjection to this preſent Government, be not a refuſal to acquieſce in the wiſe and righteous providence of God, and a flat breach of the Fifth Commandment? (See his Petition.) And now I cannot but wonder why Mr. *Baxter* ſhould move this queſtion, who that Junto of Presbyters was, *&c.* Unleſs he took as much pleaſure and glory, as others do ſhame and ſorrow in the repetition. It is a ſad Obſervation which ſome have made, That not one of the Regicides manifeſted his Repentance for that impious Act, for which they were Executed: The Lord give all guilty perſons more Grace.

Mr. *Bagſhaw* ſays, that Mr. *Baxter* was guilty of ſtirring up and fomenting the War, as any one whatſoever, *p.* 1. And my Lord of *Worceſter* ſays, that he had done what he could to make this King odious to his people, *p.* 2. Of his Anſwer, and

that

that he Sowed the Seeds of Schiſme and Sedition, and blew the Trumpet of Rebellion among them at *Kidderminſter*, *p.* 4. And adds, I my ſelf have heard him at a conference in the *Savoy*, maintaining ſuch a poſition, as was deſtructive to the Legiſlative power, both in God and Man, and produced the Aſſertion under his hand; and when Mr. *Baxter* reported that the Biſhop had defamed him; to prevent that report, the Biſhop collected ſome of his Political Theſes or Maxims of Government, the repetition of a few whereof will be too many. He tells us the War was begun in their ſtreets, before the King and Parliament had any Armies, *p.* 457. of *H. Common-wealth*. He confeſſeth that he was one that blew the Coales of our unhappy Diviſions; and that if he had been for the King, he had incurred the danger of condemnation. *H. Common-wealth*, *p.* 485. And ſhould I do otherwiſe, I ſhould be guilty of Treaſon, or diſloyalty againſt the Soveraign Power of the Land. He holds that the Soveraignty is divided between King and Parliament, and that the King invading the other part, they may lawfully defend their own by War, and the Subject lawfully aſſiſt them; *yea though the Power of the Militia be expreſly given to the King*; The Law ſuppoſing that the Militia is given the King againſt enemies, not againſt the Common-wealth: *Theſ.* 358. he ſaith (its true) that now that the Parliament hath declared, where the Soveraign Power is, he ſhould acknowledge it, and ſubmit to it, where he ſuppoſeth that the King oweth his Soveraignty to the Parliament; and if they ſhould again challenge it to themſelves, he would rather obey them than

the King; Biſhop of *Worceſters* Letter, *p.* 8. 9. And this appears clearly by what followeth, *p.* 486. That having often ſearched into his heart, whether he did lawfully engage in the War or not, and lawfully incourage ſo many Thouſands to it (the Iſſue was) he could not ſee that he was miſtaken in the main cauſe, nor dares he repent of it, nor forbear doing the ſame if it were to do again in the ſame ſtate of things, (though the Power of the Militia be given to the King.) He tells us indeed (ſays the Biſhop) that if he could be convinced that he had ſinned in this matter, that he would as gladly make a publick Recantation, as he would eat or drink; which ſeeing he hath not yet done, it is evident he is ſtill of the ſame mind, and conſequently would upon the ſame occaſion do the ſame things, *viz.* fight and encourage as many Thouſands as he could to fight againſt the King, for any thing that calls it ſelf, or which he is pleaſed to call a full and free Parliament: As likewiſe that he would own and ſubmit to any Uſurper of the Soveraignty, as ſet up by God, although he came to it by the Murder of his Maſter, and by trampling upon the Parliament. Laſtly, that he would hinder as much as poſſibly he could the reſtoring of the rightful Heir to the Crown: And now whether a Man of this Judgment, and of theſe affections, ought to be permitted to Preach or no; let any Man but himſelf Judge. And may we not reaſonably think, that thoſe Men did approve of that Helliſh Fact, who did *poſt factum*, tell the World of his Tyranny, and Male-adminiſtration of Government, and inclination to Popery: And applauded the grand Regicide, as one that did piouſly,

pusly, prudently, and faithfully to his immortal honor exercise the Government.

I conclude this with the words of a worthy Person, who Printed a view of the Life and Reign of King *Charles* the First, even when the Faction was in Power, *p.* 94. The Presbyterians carried on the Tragedy from the beginning to the end; from the bringing in the *Scots*, to the beginning of the War; from thence till they brought him Prisoner to *Holmby* House, and then quarrelled with the Independents for taking the work out of their hands, and Robbing them of the long expected fruit of their Plots and Practices. —The Independents confessed they had put *Charles Stuart* to death, but that the King had been murthered long before by the Presbyterians, who had deprived him of his Crown, Sword, and Scepter; of his Sword by wresting from him the Militia; of his Scepter, divesting him of his power of calling Parliaments; they deprived him of his natural Liberty, as a Man of the Society of his Wife and Children, and attendance of Servants, and of all those comforts which might make his Life valuable; so that there was nothing left for the Independents to do, but to put an end to those Calamities, into which this miserable Man had been so accursedly plunged by the Presbyterians. And so much for the Juncto of Presbyters, that dethron'd the King.

The main Battalia being thus discomfited, the little reserves will be more eatily defeated.

Mr. *Baxt.* Was it they that Petitioned and protested against it?

Answ. Who ever Petitioned or protested against the

the proceedings againſt the King, until the Army took him out of the Parliaments power? and was he not dethron'd before that time? afterward perhaps ſome of them did as the *Hiena*, that hath deſtroyed a Man and gorged himſelf, weep and howl over the Carcaſs, becauſe he could not devour him wholly.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether it was not an Epiſcopal Parliament (forty to one, if not an hundred) that began the War againſt the King?

Anſw. With what face can one that pretends to Truth ſay this? when it is ſo notoriouſly known, that till by a prevailing Faction in that Parliament, the Biſhops, and the Loyal and Epiſcopal party were forced away, nothing could be done againſt the King.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the General and Commanders of the Army, Twenty to one, were not Conformiſts?

Anſw. They had been ſuch indeed, but, when they began the War, they neither feared God, nor honoured the King, but made the Reformation of Religion, the pretence of the War; which as the Covenant ſhews, was the aboliſhing of Biſhops, Liturgy, *&c.*

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the Major Generals in the Countries were not almoſt all Epiſcopal Conformiſts?

The Earl of *Stamford* was over your Country.

Anſw. Stamford I knew, and one *Baxter* his Engineer; but that he was either a Major General, or a Conformiſt I never heard. The firſt Major General that I knew in theſe parts was *Desborough*, after that the Kingdom was Cantonized; and I believe the

Turkiſh

Turkiſh Baſhaws, were as much Conformiſts as any of them.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the Admiral and Sea-Captains were not almoſt all Epiſcopal Conformiſts (as *Heylen* diſtinguiſheth them of Arch-Biſhop *Abbots* mind, diſliking Arminianiſme, Monoplys, *&c.*

Anſw. I ſuppoſe the Admiral and his Officers had well ſtudied the points of Arminianiſme; when, as Mr. *Baxter* that fought againſt them, wrote for them in the judgment of his Brethren, and as I have heard that Dr. *Hammond* ſaid of him, he was an *Arminian* too, though he did not know it.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the Epiſcopal Gentry did not more of them take the Engagement (and many Epiſcopal Miniſters) more than the Presbyterians?

Anſw. The King was dethroned before the engagement was impoſed, and if you drove any of the Epiſcopal party into that Snare; I hope that as *Peter* for denying his Maſter, they have repented of it, and ſo are pardoned, I wiſh I could ſay ſo much of the Covenanters.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the Arch-biſhop of *York*, were not the Parliaments Major-General?

Anſw. That he was a Traitor if he took any ſuch Commiſſion is no doubt, and when among the Twelve, there was one that ſold his Maſter, 'tis not ſtrange, if there were one of Twenty four Biſhops that betrayed his Liege Prince; it was pitty that any Apoſtate Clergy-man ſhould have an higer Office in that Army than Mr. *Baxter*, but

I think you did them more ſervice, as an Adjutant General, than he as a Major General.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether if this Parliament, which made the Act for Uniformity and Conventicles, ſhould quarrel with the King, it would prove them to be Presbyterians and Non-conformiſts?

Anſw. This is that which I know too many did expect, and I hope they will never live to ſee it; but if it ſhould have happened, I would ſay, they had as much contradicted their principles, and falſified their ingagements, as Mr. *Baxter* had done, almoſt.

Mr. *Baxt.* Whether the Presbyterian Miniſters of *London*, and *Lancaſhire*, did not write more againſt the Regicides and Uſurpers, and declare againſt them, than all the Conformiſts? or as much?

Anſw. What they did againſt the Regicides, was long after the King was dethron'd, and ſo is not pertinent to the queſtion; yet I have ſomewhere read, that the *London* Miniſters, about 59. in number, as I remember, in an endeavour to vindicate themſelves from the Blood of the Royal Martyr, Printed 1678. did ſay thus; The woful miſcarriages of the King himſelf, which we cannot but acknowledge to be very many, and great in his Government; have coſt the Three Kingdoms ſo dear, and caſt him down from his excellency, into a horrid pit of miſery beyond example. This was a Repentance ſomewhat like that of *Judas*, when he had irrecoverably ruined his Lord and Maſter, but he could not waſh his hands from that innocent Blood.

Mr. *Bax.*

Mr. *Baxt.* And the Long Parliament was forced and moſt of them caſt out before the King could be deſtroyed.

Anſw. But not before the King was Actually dethroned, and it was about Twelve Moneths before they were forced off by the Army, that they Voted their Non-addreſſes.

Mr. *Baxt.* And when they were reſtored, it made way for his Reſtoration.

Anſw. Surely they could not do it on your principles, which aſſert that the King may be depoſed; nor are the Subjects afterward to trouble themſelves for his Reſtoration; nor is the injured Prince himſelf to ſeek his reſettlement, if the Common-wealth may proſper without him, and ſo he is obliged to reſign his Government; and thus the people being free from any Obedience to him, may choſe another King, or if not, a Common-wealth may be pitcht on. And had it been left to the Presbyterians to bring in the King on their Articles, he had not been admitted to this day.

Mr. *Baxt.* And Sir *Thomas Allen* Lord Mayor, and the City of *London* inviting General *Monck* from the *Rump* into the City, and joyning with him, was the very day that turned the Scales for the King. Not forgetting that Mr. *Baxter* Preached to the Parliament, as he often tells us the day before the King was Voted home.

Anſw. Sir *Thomas Allen*, and the City did their duty Nobly and Worthily; but what turned the Scales againſt the *Rump*, that you reflect ſo upon, that *Rump* which while it had a better name, and a little more power, though then its nakedneſs appeared ſufficiently, you prayed for it in theſe words,

words, *May the Parliament be holy, and this aſcertained from Generation to Generation, by ſuch a neceſſary regulation of Elections, as I have hereafter deſcribed, and that all thoſe that by wickedneſs have forfeited their Liberties, may neither chooſe nor be choſen*, p. 14. 15. And again, *That they were ſworn, and ſworn, and ſworn again to be faithful to, and to defend them; and that they were the beſt Governors in all the World, and ſuch as it is forbidden Subjects to oppoſe upon pain of Damnation.* So that I conclude, whoever reſtored this King (for which let God have all the praiſe) I ſtill affirm, it was a Junto of Presbyters that dethroned his Royal Father.

This may ſuffice concerning the third and fourth part of the Accuſation of deſtroying the King and diſloyal principles.

The Fifth, That they are plotting a Rebellion, to which Mr. *Baxter* forgat to make any defence. Only he thought it his duty to give this account of their principles, as far as they are known to him. Where Firſt, he ſeems rather to defend than diſclaim his Political Aphoriſms, though he deſires the Book may be taken as *Non ſcriptus*: This will not ſatisfie; If he be of another Judgment now, he ought to have undeceived his party by confuting thoſe dangerous principles, whereas he rather continueth to practiſe them ſtill. But what I Judge undeniable, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, I here declare. Now let the Reader go on from theſe words, until he come to the period, where he ſays, As I have here deſcribed the Judgment of ſuch Non-conformiſts as I have Converſed with, I do deſire thoſe that ſeek our blood and ruine by the

falſe

falſe accuſation of Rebellious principles to tell me if they can; what body or party of Men on Earth, have more ſound and Loyal principles of Government and Obedience? And if any perſon can extract any ſuch principles within all that period, I will ſay, he hath turn'd Mr. *Baxter*'s Whetſtone into the Philoſophers Stone. He ſays, indeed we are all bound, if it be poſſible, and as much as in us lyeth to live peaceably, and follow peace with all men. But how have they followed this principle? We have, he ſaith, many years beg'd for peace of thoſe that ſhould have been the Preachers, and wiſeſt promoters of peace, and cannot yet obtain it, nor quiet them, that call for fire and ſword, not knowing what ſpirit they are of. This is the Presbyterian way of Petitioning for Peace, to rail againſt their Superiours, charging them with perſecution, fire and ſword; and aſſerting that there can be no peace, until the Laws for Conformity be all reverſed, the Biſhops Authority and the Kings too, in Eccleſiaſtical affairs taken away, the Liturgy exchanged for Mr. *Baxters* new *Directory*, as he hath at large declared in the firſt part; and ſuch a deſolation as this they call peace, *ſolitudinem volunt & pacem vocant.* He ſays, the Declaration about Eccleſiaſtical affairs telleth us, that the King would have given the people peace. *Anſw.* And there were a ſort of men, whom the King for peace ſake, deſired to read only ſo much of the Liturgy as was beyond exception, and they would not; did not theſe tell the World they would have no peace but victory? So true it is as Mr. *Baxter* ſays, with unpeaceble Clergy-men, no Plea, no Petition (no not

of

of the King himſelf) could prevail, but the things that have been are, and the Confuſions of our age come from the ſame cauſes and ſorts of men, as the Confuſions in former ages did; for which we need not go to Mr. *Baxters Church Hiſtory*, the Men and methods of 41. and 42. are well nigh revived. They told His Majeſty in their ſecond Paper for Peace, That if he would grant their deſires, it would revive their Hearts to daily and earneſt Prayers for his Proſperity. But what if he deny them? Then *p.* 12. it aſtoniſheth us to foreſee what doleful effects our Diviſions would produce, which we will not ſo much as mention in particular, leſt our words ſhould be miſunderſtood. And it is obvious enough to whom they would apply that paſſage, *p.* 117. of their reply to the Exceptions: As *Baſil* ſaid to *Valens* the Emperour, that would have him pray for the Life of his Son: If thou wilt receive the true Faith, thy Son ſhall live; which when the Emperour refuſed, he ſaid, the Will of the Lord be done: So we ſay to you, if you will put on Charity, and promote peace, God will honor you; but if you will do contrary, the Will of the Lord be done with your honors. *Amen* ſay I: Let them fall into the hands of God, who is ſtill exceeding gracious to them, and not into the hands of ſuch cruel men, who have War in their Hearts while they Petition for Peace. And will Mr. *Baxter* ſtill demand what party of Men on Earth have more Loyal Principles. Our *Engliſh* Papiſts, who as Mr. *Baxter* grants adhered to the King, would be offended if I ſhould ſay, they that fought againſt the King, were more Loyal than they, who

with

with Lives and Fortunes fought for him; dares he compare with the Church of *England*, who lived and died, and roſe again with their King, to the great regret and envy of thoſe Men? I will not ſay only that the Primitive Chriſtians, but even the Old *Greeks* and *Romans* had better Principles than any you practiſe by, and will riſe up in Judgment againſt ſuch a Generation. How vainly do you inquire what *Hottoman* or *Bodin* have written? Conſider the Precepts of our great Lord, and the Practice of the Primitive Chriſtians for the firſt 600. years, and how nigh the true Members of the Church of *England* followed thoſe Principles and Examples for Twenty years together, and how far the Presbyterians Acted contrary to them, and then convince the World whether the party you Boaſt of, or theſe were moſt Loyal. But Mr. *Baxter* demands; Muſt this Age anſwer for their Fathers deeds; what is all this to the preſent Non-conformiſts? *Anſw.* If they follow the deeds of their Fathers, we cannot deny them the reputation of being their Children, who (without controverſie) begat and Nurtured them.

And though I have not the opportunity to aſk thoſe Noble Lords and Gentlemen, whom Mr. *Baxter* names concerning the Conformity of their Fathers; yet I can give you their Senſe, and the Opinion of the whole Nation, concerning the behaviour of their Children; who have as great a mind to begin a ſecond War. And take it in the beſt *Engliſh* Dialect, (*i. e.*) in the Acts of Parliament; And firſt in the Act againſt Conventicles, 16. *Car.* 2*di N.* 2. For providing of further and more ſpeedy remedies againſt the growing and

dangerous practice of Seditious Sectaries, and other diſloyal perſons; who under pretence of tender Conſciences, do at their meetings contrive inſurrections, as late experience hath ſhewn, *&c.* And in the *Oxford* Act, they ſay of thoſe that Preach in unlawful Aſſemblies, Conventicles or Meetings, under colour or pretence of the Exerciſe of Religion, contrary to the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom, have ſettled themſelves in divers Corporations of this Kingdom, three or more in a place, thereby taking opportunity to diſtill the poyſonous principles of *Schiſms* and *Rebellion* into the hearts of His Majeſties Subjects, to the great danger of the Church and Kingdom, *&c.* Now how little difference there is between ſuch Seditious tumults and meetings, the late Rebellion in *Scotland* doth demonſtrate, where the chief Maſters of thoſe Aſſemblies Preached an *Evangelium Armatum*, and having in cold Blood barbarouſly murthered the moſt Reverend Arch-Biſhop, drew many Thouſands into the Field, and would have done the like by the King himſelf, had he been in their power, as by their Declarations we may gueſs. I do not accuſe their Brethren of *England* of Rebellion; the Parliament ſays, their actions tend to it, and that is, Tantamount to a Plot. Sedition and tumults, open and profeſſed diſobedience to the Laws, adhering to a Rebellious Covenant, refuſing the Teſts of Obedience, which require only the diſclaiming of Rebellious Principles and Practices, Preaching and Printing what is actually Seditious, and tends directly to Rebellion; and all this when our Parliament hath declared that there is an horrid Plot

on

on foot, for the deſtroying of the King and eſtabliſhed Religion; to the latter whereof you are avowed Enemies: this may draw at leaſt a ſuſpition on you, that you are in the Plot, whether you know it or no; for as I ſuppoſe, in the beginning of the Firſt War, very few of them that were ingaged, intended a Plot againſt the King and the Church, yet were acted to the ruine of them both. So now a great many that call themſelves Proteſtants, may be over-acted by the Papiſts; who if they can once deſtroy the Church of *England*, by means of our diviſions, which is the moſt likely means, may cry *Victoria*, and boaſt that we have deſtroyed our ſelves. And then you may ſay truly, *p.* 123. of the ſecond part of your Plea, The blood will be on you, and your Children.

Mr. *Baxter* profeſſeth in his Preface, a deteſtation of the lying Malignity, and bloody Cruelty of the Papiſts, but *p.* 235. of his firſt part, he concludes it to be but reaſonable, if on ſuch neceſſity, (*i. e.* the penalties for Non-conformity) they ſhould accept of favour from any Papiſts that would ſave them. And that if one party, (*viz.* the authority of the Nation) would bring them to ſuch a paſs, that they muſt be hanged, impriſoned, ruined or worſe, unleſs the favour of the Papiſts deliver them; And the other party, *viz.* the Non-conformiſts had rather be ſaved by the Papiſts, than be hanged or ruined by Proteſtants, they ought not to be ſuſpected of Popery; this ſhews that he hath a better Opinion of the Papiſts than of the Conformiſts. Some bluſh not, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, to accuſe the Non-conformiſts, as the bring-

ers in of Popery by desiring Liberty, *p.* 245. that is, that there is a door opened to them by our Divisions. *Answ.* None hath more reason to blush at this than Mr. *Baxter*; for in his defence of the principles of Love, As to Popery (says he) the interest of the Protestant Religion must be much kept up, by means of the Parish Ministers, and by the Doctrine and Worship there performed (not by Conventicles then) for they that think and endeavour contrary to this, of which side soever, shall have the hearty thanks and concurrence of the Papists (who then are in the Plot.) Nor am I causelesly afraid, saith Mr. *Baxter*, that if we suffer the Principles and practices which I write against, (*i. e.* the dividers and destroyers of peace and love) to proceed without our contradiction, Popery will get by it so great advantage, as may hazard us all, and we may lose that which the several parties do contend about.

Three ways, especially Popery will grow out of our divisions.

1. By the Odium and scorn of our divisions, inconsistency and multiplied Sects. —— Thousands have been drawn into Popery, or Confirmed in it already, and I am perswaded, saith he, that all the Arguments in *Bellarmine*, and all other Books that ever were written, have not done so much to make Papists in *England*, as the multitude of Sects among our selves.

2. Who knows not how fair a game the Papists have to play by our Divisions? methinks I hear them hissing on both parties, saying to one side, lay more upon them, and abate them nothing; And to the other stand it out and yield

to

to nothing, hoping that our diviſions will carry us to ſuch practices, as will make us accounted Seditious, Rebellious and dangerous to publick peace, and ſo they may paſs for better Subjects than we, or elſe they may get a Toleration with us. And ſhall they uſe our hands to do their work? we have already ſerved them unſpeakably, both in this, and in abating the Odium of the Gunpowder Plot, and other Treaſons.

3. It is not the leaſt of our dangers, left by our follies, extremities and rigours we ſo exaſperate the Common People, as to make them readier to joyn with the Papiſts than with us, in caſe of Competitions, Invaſions or Inſurrections againſt the King and Kingdoms peace. And in the *Key for Catholicks*, The Papiſts (ſaith he) account that if the Puritans get the Day, they ſhall make great advantage of it; for they will be unſetled, and all in pieces; factions and diſtractions, (ſay they) give us footing for continual attempts; to make all ſure we will have our party ſecretly among Puritans alſo, that we may be ſure to maintain our intereſt. And in his *Holy Common-wealth*, Let the Magiſtrate cheriſh the Diſputations of the Teachers, and let him procure them often to debate together, and reprove one another, for ſo when all Men ſee that there is nothing certain among them, they will eaſily yield ſaith *Contzen* the Jeſuite.

Pudet hæc opprobria, &c. ——

You conclude your ſecond part of the Plea, with ſome Petitions out of the Liturgy, which I

have reaſon to think you do with an ill deſign; praying, that he, *whoſe Service is perfect freedom, would defend you his Humbled Servants (non ſatis humiliati quia nondum humiles,) in all aſſaults of your Enemies*, &c. Whom you mean by your Enemies all parties will gueſs. But I ſhall commend to you the ſame advice which Biſhop *Prideaux* gave the Aſſembly, when they conſulted him what they ſhould do; his direction was, that they would conſider their ways, and return to their Obedience, and ſay, in the Confeſſion of the Church. —*Almighty and moſt Merciful Father, we have erred and ſtrayed from thy ways like loſt Sheep, We have followed too much the devices and deſires of our own hearts, we have offended againſt thy Holy Laws, we have left undone thoſe things which we ought to have done, and we have done thoſe things which we ought not to have done, and there is no health in us*, &c. And the God of Heaven give us all Grace, ſo to confeſs and forſake our Sins, that we may find Mercy.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SInce my diſpatch of the former Papers, I met with a *Prognoſtication* written by *Richard Baxter*, which though it were Calculated chiefly for *England*; yet it preſumes, Firſt to foretel, *what ſhall befal the Churches on Earth, until their Concord*; and Secondly, what from *thence to the end.* But the firſt part (though it be a Contradiction in terms) may be called more agreeably to the matter, *A Prognoſtication of what is paſt*; for it hath been twice Acted over in this Nation. And the Second part is a *Prognoſtication of what never ſhall be.* For by Mr. *Baxters* method, it is impoſſible we ſhould ever ſee ſuch a *Golden Age of Love.* There are but two things worthy of the Readers notice; The Firſt is, the time when it was written, *viz. When by the Kings Commiſſion we (in vain) treated for Concord*, 1661. This circumſtance he doth with ſo much concern and diligence labour to convince the Reader of, that (as if his Reputation of being a *Prophet* depended on it) he tells you again in the firſt words of the Epiſtle; *It is many years ſince this Prognoſtication was written*, 1661. *Except the ſixteen laſt Lines*; and in the end of the Epiſtle, he cautioneth the Reader, *not to miſtake it for Hiſtorical Narratives.* And again at the end of the Book, he tells us of ſeveral Books

of his, *viz. The true and only Terms of Concord*, *Catholick Theology*, and *The Cure of Church Diviſions*, which were *all written long ſince the Prognoſtication.* This extraordinary diligence about ſo inconſiderable a Circumſtance, made me ſuſpect that it was a Soar place upon which he rubbed ſo frequently, and that it was an itch of vain glory that occaſioned it. And I believe, when I have imparted my ſecond thoughts to the Reader, he will be much of the ſame mind with me.

For, Firſt, I conſidered that there needed no ſpirit of Propheſie, to foretel what effects Non-conformity had produced many years before 1661, when he pretends this Prognoſtication was written; nor yet to foretel what the Non-conformiſts were reſolved (as much as in them lay) to attempt with all their might. Wherewith I find they were not afraid to threaten the King, and the Biſhops, as I have elſewhere obſerved.

But ſecondly, He tells us, *P.* 28. *N.* 105. That *where Papiſts or Hereticks are ſhut out by Laws, they will ſecretly contribute the utmoſt of their endeavours to make the ſufferings of Diſſenting Proteſtants as grievous as poſſibly they can; that in deſpight of them, their own neceſſities may compel them to cry out for liberty: Till they procured a common Toleration for all, and op'ned the Door for Papiſts and Hereticks, as well as for themſelves.* Where (N. B.) Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaks of a *Toleration*, which had been procured, and a Door opened for Papiſts and Hereticks, which muſt needs look back to the time paſt; and in all probability he intended that indulgence, which upon the Non-conformiſts Cries for liberty, was granted by His Majeſty about Seven

Seven years ſince; and if ſo, then this Prognoſtication was written ſome time after that common Toleration, which was of a much later date than 1661. And ſo, ſome Words and Phraſes ſeem to be, as *new Impoſitions*, *Subſcriptions and Oaths*, *and ſerving the Biſhops in Jayles*; but I lay no ſtreſs on theſe.

3. Mr. *Baxter* tells the Reader, the Prognoſtication was written 1661. *Except the Sixteen laſt Lines*, which Lines *P.* 66. begin thus. *I ſay all this is*, &c. Now it is obvious to every Reader, that there is a neceſſary connection and dependance between theſe Sixteen Lines, and that which precedes; for in the preceding Paragraph which he calls a *Conſectary*, you have theſe Nominative Caſes, which have no Verb to anſwer them, until you take in part of theſe Sixteen Lines, *viz. All the Romiſh Dreams*, *and all the Plots*, &c. *I ſay all this is*; whereby it appeared to me that the Sixteen laſt Lines were of the ſame contexture, and written at the ſame time, as the reſt was, which could not be in 1661. For thoſe Three Books of his, mentioned in the Sixteen Lines, were not then extant. So that I doubt not, but he that Reads the whole Conſectary, will be of my mind, that it was written at the ſame time, as the laſt Sixteen Lines were. And if ſo, the Prognoſtication was written ſince the Book called the *True and only Terms of Concord*, Printed 1689. I perceive by Mr. *Baxters* Contextures, that he hath not well learnt *the Art of Weaving Spiritualized.*

4. I ſuſpected alſo the *Reaſon* which Mr. *Baxter* gives why though it were written in 1661. yet

yet *it was cast by*, viz. *Lest it should offend the guilty*. Now it is notorious, whom Mr. *Baxter* condemns as *guilty*, throughout the whole *Prognostication*; namely the Bishops, whom he accounts Enemies to the Non-conformists. And it is as notorious, what little care he had of not offending them, which I have observed from *the Petition for Peace*, the *Reply to the Bishops exceptions*, and other Printed Papers, wherein Mr. *Baxter* had a chief hand. Besides in 1661. Mr. *Baxter* was on more equal terms with the Bishops, with whom he was joyned in Commission by the King, and the Bishops were not warm in their Chairs, nor did the *Act* for *Uniformity* take effect, until *Bartholomew day* 1662. And the *Sectarian Spirit* (which then prevailed among the people, was as Mr. *Baxter* observes, *p.* 40. of his Prognostication) *like Gunpowder*, ready *to take fire upon such injuries*, as he there mentioneth. So that certainly that was a fitter season for the publishing of this Prognostication, had it been then Penned, than this present juncture of Affairs in 1680. when the Bishops and Conformity are injoyned and Confirmed by Law; and so the offence is much greater, and less like to have its desired success. But if all these Conjectures should be groundless; yet the very publishing of a Prognostication of things to come, after they *are come* to pass, carrieth with it the Suspition of a Cheat, the pretence that it was written long before notwithstanding. But (whether it were written in 1661. or which I rather think in 1680.) the second thing which the Reader may observe is, that

Errat. p. 32. *it should be* n. 120.

Mr.

Mr. *Baxter* by publiſhing this Prognoſtication, hath rendered himſelf obnoxious to thoſe Laws, which are ſtill in force againſt the *ſpreaders of falſe News*, under which the Authors of pretended *Propheſies* are included. And it will be hard to find any Pamphlet that offends more againſt thoſe Laws, being directly intended to infuſe into, and incourage in His Majeſties Subjects a Seditious, Factious and Implacable Spirit, as well againſt the known Laws of the Land, as againſt the eſtabliſhed Conſtitutions of the Church, by ſuggeſting groundleſs fears, and jealouſies of things that are not, and falſe and ſlanderous repreſentation of things that are, as in P. 32. He intimates the Clergy to be *Worldly*, *Proud*, *Covetous*, *Domineering*, *Malignant* and *Lazy*; The *Plague of the World*, the *Troublers of Princes*, and *Dividers of the Churches*. And P. 9. That they will *pleaſe the great Men of the World*, *for Lordſhips*, *Wealth and Honour*, *to be Rulers of their Brethren*, *and to have their Wills*. And P. 12. *Being Hypocrites as to Chriſtianity and Godlineſs* (*like* Judas *that loved the Bag better than Chriſt*) *they will make themſelves a Religion conſiſting of the meer Corps and dead Image of true Religion*. And P. 13. *The powerful Worldly Clergy*, *will think it their intereſt to deviſe ſome new Impoſitions*, *which they know the other cannot yield to*, *to work them out*. *Whether they be Oaths*, *Subſcriptions*, *Words or Actions*, *which they believe to be againſt Gods Word*. (Here I ſuſpect that Mr. *Baxter* had reſpect to the *Oaths*, and *Subſcriptions* required by the *Act* of *Conformity*, and by *Words*, thoſe of *Aſſent* and *Conſent*,

Vbi ſuprà N. 120.

Conſent, which were not injoyned until 1662. and therefore probably this Prognoſtication was written afterward.) And P. 14. *Their Sufferings will make many otherwiſe ſober Miniſters too impatient, and to give their Tongues leave to take down the Honour of the Clergy.* And this will *ſtir up* in the *people an inordinate, unwarrantable, paſſionate zeal, which will corrupt their Prayers, and make them ſpeak unſeemly things, and pray for the downfal of that Clergy, which they take to be the Enemies of God and godlineſs* and that, *to ſpeak eaſily or charitably of ſuch Men, is but to be luke-warm, and indifferent between God and the Devil.* P. 20. *Some* (of the Non-conforming Miniſters) *will think theſe paſſions of the people needful to check the fierceneſs of the Afflicters* (though it do *but exaſperate,*) *and therefore will let them alone. Some of the Younger or more injudicious hot-brain'd ſort* (of the Non-conforming Miniſters) *will put them on, and make them believe that all Communion with any Conforming Miniſters, or their Pariſh Churches is unlawful, and their Forms of Worſhip*, are *ſinful and Anti-Chriſtian, and that they are all temporizers, and betrayers of truth and purity, that Communicate or Aſſemble with them* And P. 22, 23. *They will carry about among themſelves*, viz. (the Heretical party) *falſe reports and ſlanders*, —— *partly, becauſe they think that humane converſe bindeth them to believe the reports which thoſe that are accounted good Men utter. And partly becauſe that they will think that the upholding of their cauſe, which they think is Gods, doth need the ſuppreſſion of theſe Mens Credits and Reputation that are againſt it.* P. 25, 26. *The Godly and Peaceable Conformiſts, will get the*

Love

Love of the Sober by their Holy Doctrine and Lives; but will be deſpiſed by the Sectaries, becauſe they Conform: And will be ſuſpected by the Proud and perſecuting Clergy, as leaning to the diſſenters, and thereupon will be under continual jealouſies and rebukes. And perhaps new points of Conformity ſhall be deviſed to be impoſed on them, which it is known their conſciences are againſt, that ſo they alſo may be forced to be Non-conformiſts, becauſe ſecret Enemies are more dangerous than open Foes; And ſo part of them will turn down-right Non-conformiſts, and the other part will live in diſpleaſure, till they ſee an opportunity to ſhew it. And theſe are the likelieſt to croſs and weaken the Worldly perſecuting Clergy of any Men. Certainly this was no *Prognoſtication* in 1661. but an *Hiſtory* of what was done betwixt that and 1680.

Concerning Princes, he ſays, he will *give no other Prognoſticks but Chriſts*, (which yet Chriſt never applyed to Princes.) *That it will be as hard for a rich Man* (*i e.* for a Prince in his ſenſe) *to enter into Heaven, as for a Camel to go through a Needles Eye. P.* 34. The Magiſtrates may gueſs by this, what Charity Mr. *Baxter* hath for them.

That this was no *Prognoſtication*, but a Plot of Mr. *Baxters* to imbroil the Nation, may farther appear by what he writes, *P.* 122, 123. Of his *Way of Concord*, where he thus carries on the deſign; He ſuppoſeth a *Decree that none ſhall Preach the Goſpel, but thoſe that ſubſcribe, ſwear, promiſe or profeſs, or do ſomewhat accounted ſinful*; that *ſtrict Laws* are made *to puniſh ſuch as diſobey*, leſt their *Commands be contemned*; then that *the Preachers* will *be caſt out* and *ſilenced*; yet *they ſtill believe*,

that

that God Commands what Man forbids, and that it is a damnable Sin, no leſs than Sacriledge and Cruelty to Souls to forſake their calling and duty: The Preachers then muſt be fined, impriſoned or baniſhed for Preaching, and the people for publick Worſhipping; but *when fined, they will go on* ſtill; *nothing* can *remedy it, but either perpetual Impriſonment, Baniſhment, or Death. When this is done, more will ariſe of the ſame mind, and continue the work: And the Prelates that cauſe this, will be taken by the ſuffering people for Thorns and Thiſtles, and grievous Wolves, and the Military Miniſters of the Devil. The indifferent common people will look on the perſecutors, as the Enemies of good Men, and of publick peace, that do all this by Pride and Domination. The ungodly rabble of Drunkards, Swearers, Adulterers, and ſuch like hating godlineſs and ſtrict living, will cry up the Prelates, and Triumph over the ſufferers. Thus the Land will be divided, the Prelates and other Perſecutors with the dirty malignant rabble of the licentious will make one party, theſe will call themſelves the Orthodox, and the Church the ſufferers, and thoſe that pitty them will be the other. The conjunction of the debauched and malignant rabble with the Prelates will increaſe ſober Mens diſaffection to them, and make Men take them for Patrons of impiety; and how ſad a Condition muſt ſuch Churches be in?* This Propheſie is the ſame for ſubſtance, and I cannot think it much different in the circumſtance of time; the deſign of this is the ſame, which in the Title Page of his *Prognoſtick*, he ſays, is *to inſtruct the Sons of Love and Peace in their duties.* But how ill doth ſuch Railery become a dying Man, or a mortified Chriſtian? to defame the preſent

ſent Governours, and teach others to do the ſame. If St. *James* ſpeaks truth, *This Mans Religion is vain*, Ch. 1. 26. And under this Artifice of pretended Propheſies, Mr. *Baxter* ſtrikes at the Root of all Authority. For if Men may be excuſed from Obeying the Laws by pretending ſomething ſinful in them (which yet they know not) when they know certainly that diſobedience is a ſin: Then on the ſame grounds that the *Presbyterians* diſobey their Rulers, the *Independents* may diſobey them, and the *Anabaptiſts* both, and *Children* and *Servants* their Parents and Maſters. And then any Man as well as Mr. *Baxter* might Prognoſticate that there can be no peace where ſuch Principles and Practices are incouraged.

And now I appeal to the *Chriſtian Reader*, whether theſe ſuggeſtions were fit Legacies for a dying Man to bequeath to a divided and dying people, of which he tells the Reader, he was *taking his farewel* in 1661. but lived to publiſh them in 1680. that is near Twenty years after, when the age was almoſt ruined by the practice of ſuch unchriſtian intimations; and *both ſides were preparing for the increaſe of their fury and extremities, and at laſt for Repentance or ruinous Calamity, if they do* (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, p. 31.) *as I have deſcribed.* And he could not but think, that with a great many his *Deſcriptions would go for Preſcriptions*, and be as a Rule and Law for too many to walk by. For in the Title Page, he ſays, it was *publiſhed to inſtruct the Sons of Love and Peace in their duties and expectations.* Theſe things conſidered, I can have no better eſteem of Mr. *Baxter*'s than I had of *Lillies Prognoſtications*, which

which were deſigns to revive and ſupport *The good old Cauſe*. Having conſidered the firſt part of the Prognoſtication, which concerns things that are paſt, there need no reflections on the ſecond part, becauſe it concerns things that never ſhall be. I only obſerve that the evils which he ſpeaks of are generally effected, but the good things are Calculated for *the golden Age of Love*; and when that revolution will be, *if ever* it be, his Prophetick Spirit cannot diſcern. If ever it be, it will be when all Men are of one mind, that is, of Mr. *Baxters* mind, who is ſeldom of the ſame mind with himſelf, and ſo it is like never to be. And therefore I adviſe the *Printer*, though not for his own profit, yet for Mr. *Baxters* Credit, and the publick Welfare, to lay up this *Prognoſtication*, and ſome other of Mr. *Baxters* Books among the *Almanacks*, for 1661.

In perpetuam Rei oblivionem.

A FAREWEL TO Mr. Baxter.

IN the Preface to your late Book of *Concord*, you desire, "That *if you erre, they* (to whom "you write) *would faithfully detect your errour*, "*that you may repent before you die*, and may leave "behind you a Recantation of all your mistakes "and miscarriages, as you say you intend to do, "upon Conviction. You confess that by our dif-"ferences, Satan hath got great advantage in "*England* against that Christian Love, which is the "Life and Character of Christs Disciples, and to "cause Wrath, Envy, Hatred and Strife, that the "honour and success of the Ministry is thereby "hindered; The Wicked and Infidels are hard-"ned, the weak scandalized, the Papists incou-"raged to despise us all; and many turn to them "scandalized by our discord: Sects are advanta-"ged, the Church and Kingdom by Division

" weakned, and the King denyed the comfort " which he might have in a loving, united, and " Concordant people. Now I beſeech you lay your hand upon your heart, and conſider whether your actions and writings have not notoriouſly contributed to theſe miſchiefs. " You confeſs that you " were one that blew up the Coals of our unhap- " py Diviſions; and that if you had been for the " King, you had incurred the danger of Condem- " nation; you gave ſeveral intimations that the " King was Popiſhly affected, (as Biſhop *Bramhal* " affirms,) you incouraged great numbers to that " War, many of which periſhed in it: You ap- " plauded the grand Regicide, as one that pru- " dently, piouſly and faithfully to his immortal ho- " nour did exerciſe the Government, you have ſince " the eſtabliſhment incouraged and defended ſepa- ration (notwithſtanding you did ſometime ſeem to oppoſe it.) And now at laſt you proclaim the terms of our Communion, to be ſuch as have increaſed an impoſſibility of Conforming. And why may I not now expoſtulate with you, as you do with thoſe whom you thought guilty of the like evil, *p.* 14. of your anſwer to *Bagſhaw*. *Is it poſſible for any ſober Chriſtian in the World to take them to be blameleſs*, or thoſe to be little ſins? what? both the violating the perſon, and the Life of (ſo good) a King? and the change of the fundamental Government or Conſtitution, and the Armies force upon the Parliament, which they promiſed Obedience to, —the making their General, Protector; The making an inſtrument of Government themſelves without the people; The ſetting up their ſecond Protectour, — The ſetting up the remnant of the Com-

Commons again, the pulling them presently down again, (of whom he said) that they had sworn, and sworn, and sworn again to be faithful to, and to defend them, and that they were the best Governours in all the World; and such as 'tis forbidden Subjects to oppose upon pain of damnation; Was all this lawful? and to do all this with dreadful appeals to God, and as for God? If all this was not Rebellion, or Treason, or Murder; is there any such crime (think you) possible to be committed? are Papists insulting over us in our shame? are thousands hardned by these and such like dealings into a scorn of Religion? are our Rulers exasperated by all this into the severities which we feel? are Ministers silenced by the occasion of it? are we made by it the by-word and hissing of the Nations, and the shame and pitty of all our friends? and yet is all this to be justified or silenced, and none of it at all to be openly repented of? I openly profess to you, that till this be done, we are never like to be healed, and restored, and that it is heinous, gross impenitence, that keepeth Ministers and people under their distress. And I take it for the sad Prognostick of our future Woe, and at best our lengthned affliction to read such writings against Repentance, and to hear so little open profession of Repentance, even for unquestionable heinous crimes, for the saving of those that are undone by these scandals, and for the Reparation of the honour of Religion which is most notoriously injured, to see Men still think that their Repentance is the dishonour of their party, and cause, whose honour can no other way be repaired, to see Men so blind as to think that the silencing of these things will hide them, as if they

were not known to the world; That man or party that will juſtifie all thoſe heinous crimes, and ſtill plead Conſcience or Religion for them, doth grievous injury to Conſcience and Religion. I have told you truly that Gods way of vindicating the honour of Religion, is for us by open free Confeſſion, to take all the ſhame to our ſelves, that it be not injuriouſly caſt upon Religion; And the Devils way of preſerving the honour of the godly, is by juſtifying their Sins, and pleading Religion for them, that ſo religiouſneſs it ſelf may be taken for Hypocriſie and wickedneſs, as maintaining and befriending wickedneſs. — And *p.* 12. Is Repentance an unbecoming thing? I hope the Act of Oblivion was not made to fruſtrate Gods Act of Oblivion? which giveth pardon to the penitent, doth it forbid us to repent of ſin, or to perſwade our Brethren to repent? where ſin is hated, Repentance will not be hated, and if ſin were as bitter as it muſt be, Repentance would not be bitter; if I was guilty of ſuch ſins as you affirm, I do openly confeſs, that if I lay in Sack-cloth and in Tears, and did lament my ſins before the world, and beg pardon both of God and Man, and intreat all Men not to impute it to Religion but to me, and to take warning by my fall, which had done ſuch unſpeakable wrong both to Chriſt and Men, I ſhould do no more than the plain light of nature aſſureth me, to be my great and needful duty, *p.* 17. Now all that *Bagſhaw* accuſed Mr. *Baxter* of, was *p.* 1. That he was as guilty of ſtirring up and fomenting that War, as any one whatever, concerning which if we take his own Confeſſion, and conſider his circumſtances being an Epiſcopal Ordained Miniſter, whoſe Office was to Preach Obedience and Peace, his

his applauding the firſt Bouteſeus, as glorious Saints in Heaven, his vindicating the Authority and War of the Parliament againſt the King, his pertinacious adhering to the Covenant, crying down the Royal Martyr as a Papiſt, after he had ſealed the ſincerity of his heart to the Reformed Religion by his blood, and the crying up of his Murtherer for a prudent, pious and faithful Governor; His principles in his Holy Common-wealth, and his preſent practices in defending Schiſm, and ſo ſowing Sedition, and reproaching the eſtabliſhed *Laws and Government*, in Church and State; if theſe do not prove him guilty of what Mr. *Bagſhaw* accuſed him, yet I am ſure they cry aloud for his Repentance, and Retractations which he once promiſed the world (*p.* 26,27. of his Defence of the Principles of Love) but never (that I hear of) hath been ſo ingenious to perform as he ought. It is an ill diverſion for ſuch a perſon to baniſh the thoughts of repenting for his own ſins, by inquiring into the heinous ſinfulneſs of Conformiſts. I wiſh heartily he could prove his innocency in the one, as eaſily as they can in the other; and if he cannot clear his innocence, that he would manifeſt his penitence, then would I as readily give him the right hand of fellowſhip, as he now denyeth it to others, and he might be as great an inſtrument of peace on earth among the Saints, as of joy in Heaven among the Angels of God. I ſhall only beſeech Mr. *Baxter* to ſay that Prayer heartily, which he hath penned in the 251, and 252. pages of his Cure of Diviſions, and then let him reply as he thinks fit.

" Lord hide not my own miſcarriages from my " ſight, and ſuffer me not to take any ſin that I have " com-

" committed, to have been my innocency, or duty,
" leſt I ſhould dare to Father ſin on God, and leſt
" I ſhould live and dye without repentance, and leſt
" I ſhould be one, that continueth judgments and
" danger to the Land; ſtir up ſome faithful friend to
" tell me with convincing evidence, where it is that I
" have miſcarried, that contrition may prepare me for
" the peace of remiſſion. O ſave me from the plague
" of an impenitent heart that cannot indure to be
" told of ſin, and from that ungodly tolly, which
" taketh the ſhame which Repentance caſteth upon
" ſin, to be caſt upon God and Religion, which bind
" us to Repentance and Confeſſion. *Amen.*

Now when you have humbly and ſincerely renewed this Prayer to Almighty God, I beſeech you to conſider ſeriouſly with your ſelf, that it may be God hath in anſwer to your prayers, raiſed up ſo vile an inſtrument as I am to be your Monitor, that what you thought your *duty* is your *ſin*, and that you are one that *ſtill continueth judgments and danger to the Land*. For firſt, you ſeemed doubtful of it, when you prayed againſt it. 2. When after long and mature deliberation, you entred into Communion with our Church in all its Ordinances that concern Lay-Communion, and reſolved together with other of your Brethren to continue in it, and by that practice of yours, as well as your Arguments, did influence many others to a like pious and peaceable behaviour; how can it be leſs than a ſin againſt God, and a grieving and gravelling the Conſciences of ſuch well-diſpoſed Chriſtians, not only to withdraw your avowed Communion, but to practiſe that which directly tends to Diviſion and Confuſion? 3. That in the judgment of ſuch as were very pious and learned

learned men (in your own Opinion) that practice of yours, which continueth and encourageth ſeparation from our Communion, is ſinful; ſuch were *Cranmer*, *Ridly*, *Peter Martyr*, and others that compiled the Liturgy in King *Edward* the VI. days, and *Parker*, *Grindal*, *Horne*, *Jewel*, who reviewed and recommended it in Queen *Elizabeths* days. Such were *Uſher*, *Davenant*, *Potter*, *Hall*, *Carleton*, and others in the days of King *James* and King *Charles* of Bleſſed Memory. What think you of all theſe ſober and moderate Conformiſts, ſuch as *Bolton*, *Whately*, *Fenner*, *Dent*, *Crook*, *Dike*, *Stock*, *Smith*, *Preſton*, *Sibbs*, *Stoughton*, *Taylor*, &c. Theſe you confeſs were no ignorant nor temporizing perſons. What think you of *Jacob* and *Johnſon*, who were Independents, yet wrote againſt ſeparation? And what think you of the moſt learned and pious of the Non-conformiſts, ſuch as *Cartwright*, *Egerton*, *Hilderſham*, *Dod*, *Ames*, *Parker*, *Baines*, *Brightman*, *Ball*, *Bradſhaw*, *Paget*, *Langly*, *Nichols*, *Hering* who wrote more againſt ſeparation than any of the Conformiſts themſelves? (as you affirm.) What think you of the Aſſembly of Divines, *Twiſs*, *Gataker*, &c. Principles of Love, *p.* 57.

Among whom you ſay you never heard but of Five Non-conformiſts? what think you of ſuch as have Conformed ſince 1660. ſuch as *Reynolds*, *Conant*, *Wallis*? and laſtly what think you of the Father of all the Non-conformiſts Mr. *T. Cartwright*, who after he had written as much as he could againſt Conformity, ſaw ſo much of the weakneſs of his arguments, as that he repented and Conformed at laſt? If all theſe have judged a bare withdrawing of the people from our Communion to be unlawful, and againſt their duty; I wonder how you can ſtill think your

more

more poſitive oppoſing and hindring of it to be your duty. I conſidered again, that to live in the contempt of the Laws and lawful Autority both of Church and State, in a well eſtabliſhed Kingdom, is a ſin of no mean nature in it ſelf, and by its effects may prove exceeding ſinful; for *Schiſm* and *Diviſion*, *Spiritual Pride* & *Cenſoriouſneſs*, are as certainly ſins, and perhaps greater than *Whoredom* and *Drunkenneſs*; and *Rebellion* is as the ſin of Witchcraft. I conſidered alſo that you have had long experience of the evil of Schiſm, *how great a matter a little fire kindleth*, and did meditate and foretel (with what deſign I know not) in the ſecond paper to the King, *p.* 12. " That " if you ſhould loſe the opportunity of your deſired " Reconciliation, *i. e.* if you could not obtain what you would, it aſtoniſhed you to foreſee what doleful effects your diviſions would produce; Theſe and ſuch other motives prevailed with me to become your Monitor, that what you now take to be your duty is your ſin, and that your preſent practice tends to the continuing of judgments and danger to the Land; and if my charitable admonition to you, and peaceable endeavors for unity and eſtabliſhment in the Church and State be ſtill deſpiſed; I can only continue my prayer to God, as well for my ſelf as you in the Petitions above mentioned: *Lord, hide not our own miſcarriages from our ſight*, &c.

Cujus Aures clauſæ ſunt ut ab Amico verum audire nequeat, hujus ſalus deſperanda eſt.
Cicero *de Amicitia.*

FINIS.